

# THE RIOTS OF 1953

THE AHMADI PERSPECTIVE



# THE RIOTS OF 1953



# THE RIOTS OF 1953

## The Ahmadi Perspective



THE RIOTS OF 1953  
The Ahmadi Perspective

Present Edition: UK 2023

©Islam International Publications Ltd.

No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any form  
or by any means graphic, electronic or mechanical, including  
photography, recording, copying or information storage  
and retrieval systems without permission of the publisher.

Published by:

Printed and bound by:

ISBN:

‘We are Muslims first  
and Muslims last. We are  
a part of Islam.’



## *Contents*

<i>Map</i>	i
<i>A Note to Readers</i>	iii
<i>Foreword</i>	v
Written Statement of Sadar Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan	1
Witness Testimony of Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad <sup>ra</sup>	45
Witness Testimony of Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan	85
<i>Endnotes</i>	107







Heatmap of the riots of 1953



## *A Note to Readers*

The bringing together of this collection of documents is not meant to be anything other than a completely faithful reprinting of original source materials that are of the utmost historical importance.

Except for some minor formatting and lexical changes, all the documents reprinted here have been done so in their closest original form with all words, spellings, compositional details, and even errors and inconsistencies left preserved and uncorrected so that the past can speak directly to the reader.

In certain instances, passages from the books of the founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad<sup>as</sup>, and the writings of the then head of the community, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad<sup>ra</sup> have been quoted with certain errors in the text. As a remedy to this, the correct excerpts have been reproduced in a series of endnotes along with their English translations, which are not provided in the original source material.



## *Foreword*

In February 1953, a series of violent demonstrations broke out across the Punjab in response to a widespread hate campaign against Pakistan's Ahmadis. The riots lasted until April and were at their worst in the provincial capital of Lahore where the military had to be called in to quell the agitations. The citywide martial law which was imposed on 6 March was the first of its kind in Pakistan. In total, 20 people were killed in the violence. The province was also marred by widespread looting, arson, and common assault during the period of the riots.

The founding members of Pakistan, led by their Quaid, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, were secularists in their principles and ideals yet throughout the independence movement their chief rallying cry was that of Islam. Religion presented itself as the common thread by which they were able to unite disparate Muslims of different ethnicities, languages, and cultures. It also augmented the two-nation theory advanced by Jinnah to the British by which he argued that the chasm between the Muslims and Hindus of the subcontinent was so vast that they could not feasibly be expected to live together in harmony. As soon as the country was formed, the role of Islam in the new polity assumed a prominent position in the national debate and religious groups like the Jamaat-e-Islami, who had originally opposed its creation, seized the opportunity to advance their own theocratic version of statehood.

A minor victory was struck as early as 1949 when the Objectives Resolution—a preamble to Pakistan's first constitution—admitted certain religious concessions. Running concurrently with the issue of Islam was the notorious Ahmadi question.

The Ahmadiyya Muslim Community was founded in British India by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad<sup>as</sup> who lived between 1835 and 1908 in the town of Qadian, Punjab. Ahmad<sup>as</sup> claimed to be the Promised Messiah and Mahdi long awaited by the Muslim world, and in this capacity a prophet of God. He also declared that Jesus<sup>as</sup> had died a natural death and was not raised alive to heaven, while forbidding Jihad against the British on the grounds that they afforded full religious freedom to all their citizens within India. His message met with widespread scorn from orthodox Muslims and he was swiftly declared an apostate and an agent of the Raj. Even predating Pakistan, members of the community were routinely harassed, boycotted, and at times murdered for their perceived heresy.

In the newly formed Pakistan, Islamic clerics saw a perfect opportunity to decide on the religious status of Ahmadis once and for all. The first calls to have Ahmadis declared non-Muslim came from the Majlis-e-Ahrar when the Objectives Resolution was being framed. However, lawmakers showed no appetite to acquiesce to their demands and little headway was made. The Ahrar, however, were not deterred and would soon have the opportunity to raise the Ahmadi question again.

On 21 January 1953, the Ahrar this time with the support of the Jamaat-e-Islami and other ulema through the recently convened All Pakistan Muslim Parties Convention issued an ultimatum to Khawaja Nazimuddin, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, to declare Ahmadis a non-Muslim minority and to remove Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan as the foreign minister

of the country as well as other Ahmadis from key posts within the government and civil service. If not, the clerics threatened direct action (*raast iqdam*) against the state to ensure their demands were met. Many also suspected the Chief Minister of Punjab, Mian Mumtaz Daultana, of aligning with the ulema as a means of furthering his own political ambitions by engineering the downfall of Nazimuddin. In the aftermath of the riots, Shaukat Hayat Khan, the veteran politician who first called for an inquiry into the disturbances openly accused Daultana of tacitly supporting the rioters. Ultimately, Nazimuddin's government refused to comply with the demands of the ulema, and a decision was taken to arrest the leading members of the movement. The riots began immediately after the first arrests were made.

For all the immediate term causes, the origins of the disturbances were long-standing. The Pakistan that emerged after the partition of India, was a country with no deep-rooted historical or geographic foundations, nor were those who found themselves within the borders of the new state bound to each other by ethnicity, race, language, tribal allegiance, or cultural values. The one unifying force was religion, and the founders of the country unreservedly utilised the language of Islam to try and create a sense of social cohesion, despite, in many cases, their own lack of faith. If religion was to be the glue that brought the country together, then in the minds of the clergy, they and not the politicians ought to be the architects of the new state and the quickest way to gain a foothold in the new political landscape was through the Ahmadi question. But the reigniting of the debate around Ahmadis was not just a matter of a suddenly empowered clergy flexing their might. For all of their bravado, beneath the surface the ulema were also searching for their own sense of place and meaning within the recently formed nation.



During the years of the independence movement the likes of the Ahrar, the Jamaat-e-Islami, and many other religious parties among India's Muslims had forcefully opposed the creation of Pakistan. The Ahrari leadership referred to the potential new state as *Palidistan* (land of the impure) and portrayed Jinnah as an infidel. Syed Abul A'la Maududi and the Jamaat-e-Islami also actively worked against the Muslim League and the creation of Pakistan, deriding Jinnah as someone 'who does not know even the basics of Islam' and the Muslim League as a secular rather than religious movement. In Maududi's estimation the Pakistan which the Muslim League sought to create was one which would be openly antagonistic to the ulema in the same vein as Ataturk's secular incarnation of Turkey.

When Pakistan became a reality, the ulema found themselves discredited. For legitimacy and standing they once again exploited the Ahmadi question, much as they had done during the years of the British Raj.

In the aftermath of the violence of 1953, the government of Pakistan constituted a Court of Inquiry to investigate the disturbances and examine the causes and factors that led to the riots, and to suggest measures to prevent such situations from arising in the future. The Inquiry into the disturbances commenced on 1 July 1953 and concluded in January the next year. The final report was published on 10 April 1954. *The Munir Report* or *The Munir-Kiyani Report* as it came to be known, did not simply limit itself to investigating the disturbances, but delved into the very heart of the question of what it means to be Muslim and who gets to define an individual's *muslimness*, as well as ruminating on fundamental questions about nationhood and Muslim nationalism. While blame for the riots was primarily apportioned to an unruly set of ulema, the report also accused the provincial government

of the Punjab of standing by and allowing the violence to develop and spread across the province, as well as provincial government affiliated newspapers who helped whip up support for the anti-Ahmadi movement through editorials and comment pieces. The report further concluded that not only did the state have no right to interfere with a person's religious beliefs, but that there was no consensus among Islamic scholars as to an agreed definition of what it meant to be a Muslim. After hearing the testimonies of the ulema the two justices concluded:

But we cannot refrain from saying here that it was a matter of infinite regret to us that the *ulama* whose first duty should be to have settled views on this subject, were hopelessly disagreed among themselves... Keeping in view the several definitions given by the *ulama*, need we make any comment except that no two learned divines are agreed on this fundamental [definition of a Muslim]? If we attempt our own definition as each learned divine has done and that definition differs from that given by all others, we unanimously go out of the fold of Islam. And if we adopt the definition given by any one of the *ulama*, we remain Muslims according to the view of that *alim* but *kafirs* according to the definition of every one else.

Also called to testify before the Court of Inquiry were the then head of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community in Pakistan, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad<sup>ra</sup>, and the country's foreign minister Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, an Ahmadi by faith and one of the main targets of the agitators. The former provided his testimony between 13-15 January 1954, and the latter on 16 January. The primary administrative body of the movement in Pakistan, Sadar Anjuman Ahmadiyya, also submitted a written

testimony to the court of the community's version of events on 22 July 1953.

The above-mentioned documents have been brought together in this volume in their original form. Each provides a unique insight not only into the events of the time, but also the historical origins of anti-Ahmadi hatred, the theological and polemical divides between Ahmadis and orthodox Muslims, as well as the political and existential struggles faced by the nascent state of Pakistan. The written statement of the community which appears first by chronological order, details the community's perspective on the circumstances which led to the riots and their longer term historical background, who the community saw as responsible for the disturbances, as well as the community's view on the government's response to the riots. Owing to the nature of the questions put before him, the witness testimony of the head of the community is of a more theological kind with his answers providing key insights into fundamental issues of contention such as the Ahmadi interpretation of *Khatme Nabuwwat* (the finality of the Prophethood of the Holy Prophet of Islam), how Ahmadis view the religious status of other Muslims, Ahmadi beliefs regarding the coming of the Imam Mahdi, and what status do Ahmadis ascribe to the founder of the community. Sir Zafarullah's testimony on the other hand is one marked by answers to questions regarding palace intrigue, conspiracy theories, and realpolitik.

Seventy years on and the events of 1953 still remain one of the great seismic moments in the history of Pakistan. The disturbances were the direct cause of the first ever martial law in the country; they presaged the growth of intolerance, religious extremism, and the politics of exclusion that were to become defining hallmarks of Pakistan in the years ahead, as well as Pakistan's struggle for a clear sense of identity and purpose; and they also provided an unforgiv-

ing glimpse into the future marginalisation and persecution not just of Ahmadis, but all of the country's religious minorities. And yet despite being such a major milestone in the formative journey of the country, the '53 riots have largely become one of the great forgotten chapters of Pakistani history. In the present day context of the country, however, and the constant religious and political instability that has embroiled the nation over the past several decades, it is perhaps more critical now to revisit the disturbances than it has ever been before.

For one thing, *The Munir Report* has long been hailed for pointing out the potential dangers faced by Pakistan if it chose the path of mixing religion with politics. Unfortunately, in subsequent years many of these warnings were fatally ignored. As such, commentators have come to see the report as the foundational text and blueprint for what a secular Pakistan could look like and how it can be achieved. The relevance of the report extends beyond just Pakistan. During the reign of the Shah *The Munir Report* was studied in Iran, and in Egypt during the nationalist government of Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Any discourse on the disturbances that does exist in Pakistan, is more often than not highly charged, mired in controversy, and told from the perspective of the clerical elite who hail the riots as one of the great coming of age moments of Pakistan on its path to becoming a fully formed Islamic Republic. Within these discussions the Ahmadi perspective is completely sidelined and ignored particularly so, since 1984 and the promulgation of Ordinance XX by General Zia-ul-Haq, which in effect not only criminalized the religious and civic identities of Ahmadis in Pakistan, but also silenced their voices and made it almost impossible for members of the community to talk about their faith, their politics, and their history within the public sphere. In this sense, the publishing of

these documents isn't just the resurfacing of history, but a fresh and revealing addition to the discourse around Ahmadis that continues to shape Pakistan even in the present day.

I

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF  
SADAR ANJUMAN AHMADIYYA PAKISTAN



In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful,  
We praise Him and invoke His blessings on His noble Prophet.

---

Before the Hon'ble the Court of Enquiry constituted under  
Ordinance III of 1953, High Court,  
Lahore.

Written statement on behalf of the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya  
Pakistan Rabwah, named as a party by order dated 1.7.53 by the  
Hon'ble Court.

---

Respectfully sheweth:-

1. By order dated the 1<sup>st</sup> July, 1953, the Hon'ble Court of Enquiry has been pleased to implead the Sadr (Central) Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Pakistan, Rabwah (hereinafter referred to as the Anjuman) as a party to the present proceedings and has directed it to state its case on each of the terms of reference, namely;

- i - Responsibility for the disturbances,
- ii - Circumstances that led to the declaration of Martial Law on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March, 1953, and
- iii - Adequacy or otherwise of the measures taken by the Provincial Civil Authorities to prevent and subsequently, to deal with the disturbances, and particularly its attitude towards the Ahrar-Ahmadiyya controversy.

2. In order to ascertain accurately the causes of the recent disturbances it is necessary to examine the antecedents of the Ahrar in pre-partition India and in the light of these antecedents to assess the nature of their activities in Pakistan and the motives



behind those activities.

3. The Ahrar were a group of individuals, more prominent among *them* being Maulana Habib-ur-Rahman, Syed Ataullah Shah Bokhari, Maulana Mazhar Ali Azhar, Sheikh Hisam-ud-Din, Master Taj-ud-Din, Chaudhri Afzal Haq and a few others and were paid<sup>1</sup> workers of the Congress. Their speeches and writings were not intended to raise the spiritual or moral uplift of the Muslim masses but only to preach hatred against the Government and to hold up to ridicule all Muslim organisations which were anxious to protect Muslim interests and to dubb them as sycophants. It is no doubt true that even in this period they carried on their so-called national activities under the garb of religion, i.e., the method employed was ostensibly religious. In fact in 1928, the Indian National Congress brought out the Nehru Report as the political demand of the people of India. The Nationalist Muslims who had not yet formed into the Ahrar Party supported<sup>2</sup> the Nahru Report. The Head of the Ahmadiyya Community wrote a book on the Nehru Report. In this book he examined in detail the proposals contained in the Nehru Report and demonstrated how, if accepted, those proposals were likely to injure Muslim interests. This book convinced the Muslims of India that their political, social and religious salvation lay in rejecting the Report. The Muslim parties in consequence rejected<sup>3</sup> that Report. The congress having been foiled in its attempt to secure the acceptance of *the* Nehru Report through the good offices of the so-called Nationalist Muslims probably withdrew the financial aid which this group received from the Congress with the result that for the time being

<sup>1</sup> The Azad, 28.6.50; Life of Mr. Jinnah by B.A.Jafri, p.639.

<sup>2</sup> The Azad, 31.1.51; Afaq. 19.3.53.

<sup>3</sup> The Siyasat, Lahore, 2.12.30; Life of Mr. Jinnah by B.A.Jafri, p.183.

some of them broke off from the Congress. For some time this group of individuals was in a state of suspense. They had by their anti-Muslim activities come to be hated by the Muslim Community and became cut off from them. At the instance of Maulana Zafar Ali Khan of Zamindar,<sup>4</sup> however, they formed themselves into a separate party and named it as “Majlis-i-Ahrar”. The object of this party, as declared by their acknowledged leader, Ch. Afzal Haq, was to gain political power without which, as they thought, no substantial contribution could be made to the welfare of the nation.<sup>5</sup>

4. These people and those of their way of thinking were not constructive statesmen. They lived and thrived on disruption. There was political awakening in the country at the time and the Ahrar seized this opportunity to gain the confidence of the Muslim masses. They remained on the look-out for occasions by which they could attract public attention. One occasion presented itself when the Dogra Maharaja of Kashmir had many of his Muslim subjects mercilessly shot dead because they demanded their civic rights, which had so far been denied to them. The massacre and other attendant atrocities were at such a large scale that it shocked the whole of Muslim India, which felt impelled at the time to come to the rescue of their brethren in Kashmir. The late Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal was a mover in the setting up of a body known as All India Kashmir Committee, which was charged with the duty of getting for their Muslim brethren in Kashmir by constitutional and peaceful means the rights denied to them by the Kashmir Government. At the suggestion of the late Doctor Sahib the present Head of the Ahmadiyya Commu-

<sup>4</sup> The Siyasat, Lahore, 21.6.35.

<sup>5</sup> Khutibat-i-Ahrar, page 18.

nity was elected as President of the Committee and realising the great distress in which the Muslims of Kashmir were placed, he with considerable reluctance, agreed to accept the responsibility of that office and used all his resources for assisting them. The Ahrar felt that the situation provided an opportunity to them to secure control of Muslim masses and established direct contact with them. They were fully conscious of the fact that the militant element among the Muslims will not be attracted by constitutional and peaceful means. As trained political workers the Ahrar appealed to the masses of the Punjab to rally round them and prepared a *ambitious* programme of civil [dis]obedience, which they thought, would bring them in direct conflict with the authorities. Undoubtedly the ostensible object was to secure to the Muslims of Kashmir the rights which were denied to them. Their unconstitutional activities, however, resulted in thousands of people going to jail and in the complete dislocation<sup>6</sup> of life of thousands of other Muslims. Business in Sialkot, which was the premier commercial town in pre-partition Punjab, reached a very low ebb. The Muslim artisans suffered the most.

5. The success of the All India Kashmir Committee exasperated the Ahrar. The Muslims of India soon realized that the road to which they were being led by the Ahrar would bring them to ruin. The All India Kashmir Committee gained the confidence of the masses.<sup>7</sup> Its constitutional methods bore fruit and the State was finally forced to see reason and the measure of success achieved *baffled* the calculation of all political parties. The Ahrar rightly felt that the Committee, under the able guidance of the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, had given such a set-back to their party

<sup>6</sup> The "Dawn" Delhi, 2.12.45 & 'Nai Roshni, 9.7.53.

<sup>7</sup> Inqilab, 30.11.31 and Siyasat, 1.3.32.

that it would be difficult for them to recover their lost prestige for a long time. In the Ahmadiyya Community they felt an organised and powerful rival and felt that if they were to succeed in their aspirations they must drive this rival out of the field.

6. Consistently in the light of their previous history the Ahrar hit on the only plan known to them, namely, under the garb of religion to excite the masses against the Ahmadiyya Community. They arranged a Tabligh Conference at Qadian. The Conference was held under the auspices of the British Government, which provided for them all facilities. Many thousands of people gathered at Qadian from all parts of the country whereas the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community was restrained<sup>8</sup> from summoning members of his Community from outside. Sayyed Ataullah Shah Bokhari, the veteran Ahrar leader, in his presidential address at Qadian maligned the Community and used against them every kind of abuse and vituperation he was capable of. The address roused the feelings of the Muslims to the highest pitch against the members of the Ahmadiyya Community. Maulana Ataullah Shah was prosecuted under Section 153-A, I.P.C. but his trial was made on occasion to malign the Ahmadiyya Community and this process of vilification continued under the garb of a judicial trial. By this trial the Ahrar succeeded in exciting among a section of Muslims more hatred against the Ahmadiyya Community and gaining more popularity.

7. But the setback which the Ahrar thus partially retrieved was followed by another of a more serious character. The Shahid Ganj Mosque at Lahore was given over to the Sikhs which exasperated the Muslims. The incidents connected with the mosque led to the opening of firing by the Government with the result

<sup>8</sup> Order dated 17.10.34 signed C.C.Garbett, Chief Secretary Punjab.

that some lives were lost. The Ahrar said that those who were killed as a result of the firing had died an accursed death.<sup>9</sup> The Muslims were convinced that the Ahrar had conspired with the Sikhs and had *betrayed* the Muslim cause.<sup>10</sup> In fact to call any one an Ahrari at that time was tantamount to abusing him.

8. Some letters written by the then General Secretary of the Majlis-i-Ahrar, Maulana Mazhar Ali Azhar and a statement issued by one of their workers, throw interesting light on the working of this party. Copies of these letters are attached to this statement as Appendix 'A'. They would secretly introduce their confirmed members in the rival organizations. They would as an expedient measure join movements in order to foil them. Although their past history constitutes active participation in civil disobedience they were anxious that their party should not launch any such programme over the Shahid Ganj Mosque question.<sup>11</sup> A perusal of these letters exposes in the fullest measure the aspirations of the Ahrar and the method by which they seek to attain their object. The letters of M. Mazhar Ali Azhar conclusively establish the fact that Religion is only a convenient weapon in the hands of the Ahrar to gain political ends.

9. The Ahrar in fact never fully recovered from the shock. They soon became disillusioned in their hopes to succeed by stirring up hatred against the Ahmadiyya Community and openly allied themselves with the Congress in order to oppose the only representative organization of the Muslims the All India Muslim League. In their Conference held at Peshawar in 1939, Ch. Afzal Haq openly declared the object of his party to seize power. They

<sup>9</sup> "Nai Roshni", Karachi, 9.7.53.

<sup>10</sup> Afaq, 19.3.53.

<sup>11</sup> Tarikh Ahrar, P.173.

abused the leaders of the Muslim League and denounced it as a group of irreligious<sup>12</sup> people. Even the Qaid-i-Azam was not spared. He was denounced as having renounced Islam in order to gain the hand of a disbelieving girl (Miss Ratan Bai) in marriage. Maulana Mazhar Ali, the General Secretary, went so far as to compose the following abusive couplet<sup>13</sup> against the Qaid-i-Azam:

اک کافرہ کے واسطے اسلام کو چھوڑا      یہ کافر اعظم ہے کہ ہے قائد اعظم

10. A perusal of the files containing the activities of the members of the Executive Committee of the Central Ahrar Organization maintained in the C.I.D. Political Branch of the Provincial Government at the time will, we hope, throw interesting light on these activities. The Ahrar opposed the idea of Pakistan so vehemently as to leave no doubt that they were at that time commissioned partly at least by All India National Congress to play that role. In his presidential address given at Kasur on 1st of December 1941, Ch. Afzal Haq, dubbed Pakistan as Palidistan.<sup>14</sup> The attitude of the Ahrar was completely uncompromising. As already submitted whatever weapons they wielded against their opponents bore a religious label.

11. In spite of the activities of the Ahrar the bold stand taken by the All India Muslim League and the world forces helped in the establishment of Pakistan. Muslim India for the first time in its history made a practical demonstration of the fact that they could sink their internal differences in a common cause. A commission called the Boundary Commission was set up to assess the claims of the two parties viz., The All India National Congress and the

<sup>12</sup> Inqilab, 4.9.46.

<sup>13</sup> Life of Mr. Jinnah by B.A.Jefri, p.91.

<sup>14</sup> Khutabat Ahrar, P.83.

Muslim League and to divide the sub-continent into two independent States. The Muslim majority areas were to be placed in Pakistan and the rest of the territory was to be assigned to Hindu India. The District of Gurdaspur had barely a Muslim majority of 1.3% over non-Muslims. It had great strategic position by reason of its being contiguous to the Jammu and Kashmir State. But inspite of Gurdaspur being a Muslim majority area Hindu India was determined to have this District placed in the Indian Union on the ground of 'other factors'. The non-Muslim party before the Boundary Commission considered that if the Ahmadiyya Community were declared non-Muslim Gurdaspur could be placed in Hindu India. The Ahmadiyya population in the district of Gurdaspur could turn the scale and the side with which the Ahmadiyya Community was joined could convert it into a majority. The non-Muslim members of the Boundary Commission therefore directed a volley of questions at the representative of the Community which had for their object to elicit from him a statement that the interests of the Ahmadies lay in disassociating themselves from the claims of the All India Muslim League. But the Ahmadiyya Community unhesitatingly and in most unmistakable terms was with the All India Muslim League in their demand to have a separate Muslim State. The League authorities directed the Community to present its case separately before the Boundary Commission in order to counter the claim of the Sikhs based on 'Other factors'. The Sikhs had claimed that since in the district of Gurdaspur Siri Gobindpur was a sacred place for them it should be included in India. As against this assertion the Ahmadiyya Community put up the claim that because Qadian was the living centre of a world-wide Islamic Organization and because even otherwise Gurdaspur was a majority Muslim District contiguous to other Muslim areas it should be placed in Pakistan.

During the proceedings before the Boundary Commission when Mr. Justice Teja Singh put the specific question to the representative of the Ahmadiyya Community as to what the position of the Ahmadiyya Community was with respect to the generality of the Muslims he emphatically declared:

“We are Muslims first and Muslims last. We are  
a part of Islam”.

For several other reasons specified in their memorandum and in their address before the Boundary Commission the point was repeatedly stressed and emphasised by the representative of the Ahmadiyya Community that the District of Gurdaspur comprising the Headquarters of the Ahmadiyya Community must be placed in the Dominion of Pakistan. In addition to this the services of an expert in Geography, who was a lecturer in the London School of Economics, were requisitioned by the Ahmadiyya Community to assist in the presentation of the Muslim case before the Boundary Commission.<sup>15</sup> The Head of the Ahmadiyya Community was present with his team of workers at all the meetings of the Commission and stayed at Lahore during all this period to render *any* help he could give and no member of any consequence of the All India Muslim League is ignorant of the fact that at that critical time the Community pooled all its resources in furthering the Muslim claim. But as ill luck would have it political considerations resulted in the loss of a good and just case by the Muslims and Gurdaspur was placed in India.

12. However after a great struggle Pakistan became a reality and in the great chaos and holocaust that came in the wake of the partition the Ahrar also had to seek shelter in Pakistan along with other Muslims. There can be no mistaking the fact that they were

<sup>15</sup> Zamindar, 25.9.47.



the most detested<sup>16</sup> section among the Muslims of India at that time. They found themselves in a wilderness, baffled and befooled. For a couple of years it appeared as if there were no Ahrar in the new State of Pakistan. The Ahmadiyya Community also suffered a most serious loss because of the Partition, a loss greater than any other section of Muslims had suffered in as much as it had been dislodged from its long established Headquarters of its World Organization and had to leave almost all its property in the East Punjab. In spite of this huge loss the Head of the Community directed its activities immediately and almost exclusively towards *making* the new State strong and stable and towards this end he delivered a series of lectures from one end of the country to the other. These lectures were universally acclaimed<sup>17</sup> as most instructive and illuminating which, if properly utilized, were calculated to make Pakistan a country, which could successfully compete with other States of the world. He even urged the youth of the Community to join the ranks and fight for the Kashmir cause. A battalion was set up known as 'the Furqan Battalion' which under the control of the Pakistan Army went into the field against the Indian Army and made their humble contribution as loyal citizens of the new State. His Excellency, the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan, Army, acclaimed the services of the Battalion and the spirit of patriotism manifested by it with the following memorable words:

"You impressed us all with your keenness to learn and the enthusiasm you brought with you. You and your officers soon got over the many difficulties that face a young country.

"In Kashmir you were allotted an important sector and very soon

<sup>16</sup> The Azad, 26.12.50; The Zamindar, 20.9.47.

<sup>17</sup> Ihsan, Lahore, 5.12.47.

you justified the reliance placed on you. You nobly acquitted yourself in battle against heavy enemy ground and the air attacks without losing a single inch of ground.

“Your conduct both individual and collective and your discipline have been of a very high order.

“As your mission is over and your Battalion is under orders to disband, I wish to thank every one of you for the service you have rendered to your country. Khuda Hafiz”. (Copy of the message from the Commander-in-Chief Pakistan Army, to the Furqan Battalion read at a ceremonial parade held on June 23, 1950 at Sarai Alamgir)<sup>18</sup>

13. The responsible section of the Muslim Press, Muslim intelligentsia and the Government in power openly appreciated the activities of the Ahmadis in the Muslim cause before and after the Partition. The Community also rendered all conceivable help in this hour of distress to the Muslims of East Punjab and those of the strategic town of Amritsar in particular by money and material and by providing food to a large number of non-Ahmadi Muslim refugees, who had sought shelter at Qadian.<sup>19</sup> They also used their private aeroplane to drop food from the air to the besieged Muslims of Fatehgarh Churian and the neighbouring villages. Steadfastness of the Ahmadis in holding their own against heavy odds was widely admired. This universal appreciation must have created considerable heart-burning in the Ahrar who had remained discredited and disgruntled<sup>20</sup> all this time.

14. The first declaration of the Ahrar after the partition was a meek one by which they affirmed allegiance to the Muslim

<sup>18</sup> Nawa-i-Waqt, 25.6.1950.

<sup>19</sup> Zamindar, 11.10.1947.

<sup>20</sup> Azad, 14.11.49.

League and declared that they had given up all political activity and would consider it their sacred duty to do what they could to serve the Muslim League under the banner of the League as its humble workers. They came out with a confession that their attitude to the setting up of Pakistan had been demonstrated to be wrong by the coming into being of Pakistan and that the League had come out triumphant to which they acknowledged allegiance and in future would have nothing to do with politics.<sup>21</sup> On the death of the Qaid-e-Azam, however, there arose a ray of hope in their hearts and instead of the negative attitude previously taken up by them, they in consonance with their old game came out with a resolution in November 1948 or January 1949 that in future they would be concentrating all their activities on religion instead of on politics. They tried by the old method to read just themselves in the new set up and to gain public confidence. In fact they had never reconciled<sup>22</sup> with Pakistan. In their professed zeal to serve religion one can easily discern the seeds of their nefarious designs to stir up discord and dissension among the Muslims. They were on their old game. Tahaffuz Kahtm-e-Nabuwat was the ostensibly laudable object with which they appeared before the public. The slogan in which a most pious doctrine was used for a most impious end began to work like a magic wand. Their volunteer Organization<sup>23</sup> which had lain dormant for a considerable time came to life again. They knew of no other weapon to stir up hatred against the Ahmadiyya Community. At the same time the success which attended the efforts of the Foreign Minister, Ch. Mohammad Zafarullah Khan, and the

<sup>21</sup> The Azad, 30.4.51, 31.1.51 & 30.4.50.

<sup>22</sup> The Azad, 26.12.50, The Azad, Demand No. 11.9.52.

<sup>23</sup> The Azad, 13.7.51, The Azad, 29.10.52, The Azad, 2.4.51.

reputation which he succeeded in establishing for Pakistan in the international<sup>24</sup> sphere unfortunately created political rivalry in some responsible parties and the Anjuman has reason to suspect that this political group also helped the Ahrar in their campaign of vilification of the Community which they had now taken in hand in right earnest.

15. In an article published in the 'Azad' Lahore, dated 30th April, 1950, it was confessed that the previous attitude of the Ahrar towards the Muslim League and the Government was dictated by expediency. They professed allegiance to the League and the Government of the day to secure a footing in the new set up and that now they could lift the veil from their face and manifest themselves in true colours. From that time onward the campaign of deliberate misrepresentation and vilification against the Ahmadiyya Community assumed alarming proportions. In Friday sermons, in the Mosques and in other congregations the gospel of hatred against the Ahmadiyya Community was openly and violently preached. The Ahmadis were dubbed as apostates who should be done to death and completely extirpated. It was declared an act of piety to kill them wherever they could be found. It was falsely<sup>25</sup> and most shamefacedly represented that before the Boundary Commission the Ahmadiyya Community had asked that the District of Gurdaspur should be placed in the Indian Union. In fact all the misfortunes of the Muslims in Pakistan were attributed as they called it to the poor and dishonest representation of their case before the Boundary Commission by Ch. Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Alyaum, Cairo, 28.6.52; Aljadida, Cairo, 22.6.52.

<sup>25</sup> Ahmadiyya Memorandum P.13.

<sup>26</sup> The Azad, 14.11.52.

16. These misrepresentations and vilifications came to be broadcast with impunity from the stage, the pulpit and the press. The Government did not move in the matter. Even the fact that their Foreign Minister was being maligned did not induce them to do their obvious duty. Complete boycott<sup>27</sup> of the Ahmadis was openly preached and other Muslims were instigated to kill them. This campaign of vilification and incitement resulted in the death of several Ahmadis in different parts of the country. Put in their chronological order the first victim of this communal frenzy was Dr. Major Mahmud, who was murdered on the 20th of August 1948 at Quetta,<sup>28</sup> when he was passing near a public meeting, which was being addressed by the local Maulvis at Quetta. In the Punjab the first victim of this incitement was an Ahmadi young man, Ghulam Mohammad<sup>29</sup> who was murdered near Okara (Montgomery) on the 4th of October 1930. His murder was followed by that of another Ahmadi, Ch. Badr Din, at Rawalpindi on the 10th of October, 1950. The murderer in the Okara case confessed that he was led to kill Ghulam Mohammad as he was an Ahmadi. In the Rawalpindi case the police tried to suppress real facts and attempted to show that it was the result of a private feud. When questioned about it the authorities at Rawalpindi said that it was in the interests of the Ahmadis themselves that these facts should not appear in their true colour. On the 13th of May 1951 the Ahmadiyya mosque in Samundri (Lyallpur) was set on fire. The Provincial Government knew all that was happening but unfortunately did not move to curb the unlawful activities of this group. The Community felt what way the wind

<sup>27</sup> Beybak Sargodha 1.4.52.

<sup>28</sup> Inqilab, 29.8.48.

<sup>29</sup> Crim. Appeal 365 of 1951, Decision on 17.3.52.

was blowing. They were threatened all over the Province by the Ahar and their supporters, and these threats were duly reported to the local authorities. But nothing came out of these reports. In July 1952, according to the reports received by the Anjuman, the houses of the Ahmadis in different parts of the province were marked. In Multan Syed Attaullah Shah Bokhari directed the activities of his party and extremely provocative lectures and still more provocative processions were led by various Ahrar leaders inciting people to violence against the members of the Ahmadiyya Community. The incidents at Multan need not be mentioned because they formed the subject of an enquiry and this Hon'ble Court has already summoned findings of Mr. Justice Kayani who conducted this enquiry. At Lahore when there was a clash of the Ahrar with the Provincial Muslim League on 27.7.52 the Goondas in the town had divided Lahore into zones each of which was in charge of a particular Goonda leader and the houses of the Ahmadis must have been looted but for their clash with the police which led to the round-up of the Goondas the same night. Even this incident did not prove a sufficient eye-opener for the Provincial Government and the mosques—sacred houses of Allah—continued to be polluted for political ends and the Ahmadis continued to be vilified.<sup>30</sup> It would perhaps be pertinent at this stage to refer to the activities of the Ahrar in trying to enlist the support of other religious organisations functioning in Pakistan. In order to succeed in their designs they persuaded various organisations of Ulema and with this end in view the Ahrar formed the various Conventions persuading them to join hands with them in pressing their demands against Ahmadis and preparing the masses for the purpose.

<sup>30</sup> The Azad 19.11.52.

17. In order to secure a foothold in the Government the Ahrari Maulvis concentrated on forcing the Government to declare that Pakistan should be a Theocratic State. The idea underlying this move was that once such declarations was made, then by the right that they alone could interpret religion correctly, they could acquire great power and the Government would be at their tender mercy. For sometime therefore without disclosing the inner working of their mind the Maulvis were trying to look innocent in pressing the demand that since Pakistan was established for the preservation of Muslim culture the pattern of the Government must be purely Islamic. The Jamaat-i-Islami whose method of working was more subtle than that of the Ahrar took the lead in this matter.<sup>31</sup>

18. It will also be pertinent as this stage to give a brief history of the Jamaat-i-Islami which may be relevant for the purposes of this inquiry. This Jamaat was set up in the year 1941<sup>32</sup> and its leader Maulana Abul Aala Maududi claimed to represent the correct Islamic ideology and to working towards its realization. Its significance, however, lay in that the Maulana had opposed<sup>33</sup> the formation of Pakistan as advocated by the Muslim League. It can be safely asserted that in the establishment of Pakistan there was complete frustration for this party and its leader. However, when Pakistan became a reality its leader realised that he could now direct his activities against the Muslim League Government on religious basis and set himself to it. He had opposed the Muslim League leadership before partition on religious grounds and when the Qaid-i-Azam succeeded in getting a home for the Muslims

<sup>31</sup> "Why these arrests", page 6.

<sup>32</sup> Roadad Jamaat-i-Islami, Part I.

<sup>33</sup> Tarjumanul Quran, Feb.1946, pp.158,159

he again opposed<sup>34</sup> the leadership on religious grounds as being *غیر صالح* (unrighteous) and not worthy of the trust reposed by the nation in it. He came out with articles which were intended to malign the Qaid-i-Azam and his colleagues on the authority of religion. The attitude of Maulana Abul Aala Maududi over the Kashmir question which was vital for the integrity of the State exposed him completely. All sections of the Muslims were united in the demand to secure Kashmir at any cost. The popular mind was considerably exercised over the Kashmir question and there were volunteers to fight the battle if the State decided to enter on a war against India. The Maulvi came with the declaration that such war if waged would be un-Islamic.<sup>35</sup>

19. Side by side with this he organised a movement which made free use of such catch phrases as “Islamic Constitution” and “Islamic Government”. The idea of an Islamic constitution that he advocated had for its origin the unsatiated desire to occupy the place which the late Qaid-i-Azam had occupied. He emphasized that only those among his countrymen who were “Saleh” could be trusted to hold offices of responsibility in Islamic State and that the present leaders of Pakistan were not ‘Saleh’ and therefore all such persons should be kept out of office. By this method Maulana Maududi intended to overthrow the Government. The weapon employed apparently was religious but was inspired by an ulterior object. In the elections of the year 1950 the Maulvi thought that an opportunity had presented itself for him to win the elections and by this method to secure the Government which could be fashioned after his pattern. The stunt of ‘Saleh’ and ‘Ghair Saleh’ (*صالح اور غیر صالح*) received the widest publicity but he

<sup>34</sup> Tarjumanul Quran, Feb.1946 p.160.

<sup>35</sup> Tasneem, 12.8.48.



met with colossal failure. Only one 'Saleh' candidate was returned to the Assembly in the elections of the year 1950. This failure greatly incensed him as he had pinned high hopes. In that state of disillusionment he hit on no better plan than to take up his cudgels against the Ahmadiyya Community and by that method again to curry favour with the masses. His technique though much more subtle was not very different from that of the Ahrar. The Ahrar on their part had forced issues on the Government which it could not ignore and had succeeded, up to an extent, in polluting the masses. Both these Parties had for their common object the overthrow of the Government and they had now reached a stage where they could unite and put more pressure on the Government. The Ahrar convened an All Pakistan Ulema Convention at Karachi which was held on the 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th January, 1951. Both the Ahrar and the Jamaat-i-Islami participated in this Convention. The demands formulated at the Convention introduced for the first time the distinction between Muslim and non-Muslim citizens of Pakistan and there was also a further distinction of Muslim sects whose status was recognised and there were others whose status needed examination. This concerted action of the Ulema was inspired by a desire to establish a theocratic rule and was meant to form the basis of an intensive propaganda to secure that end. The eight points i.e. the eight demands made by the Jamaat-i-Islami from the Government embodied the demands made in that Convention. In some respects the Resolution was left advisedly vague. The word "Ahmadi" did not find an express mention in it but the foundations for maligning the Community were formally laid in the deliberations held on that occasion.

20. The eight points having been thus formulated, the Jamaat-i-Islami set about securing signatures of Muslims on printed forms containing these demands. The intention was to flood the

Government with thousands of such printed letters so as to impress upon it the necessity of conceding their demands. These demands did not include in express terms that the Ahmadiyya Community should be declared a minority. The Ahrar, however, were busy with their own game and had succeeded to a certain extent in influencing the uneducated masses in securing support to the claim that Ahmadis be declared a non-Muslim minority. The Jamaat-i-Islami sensed a danger to their leadership if they did not include this demand amongst the eight demands already formulated by them. It is surprising that inspite of the claim of its leader that the eight demands formulated by him included, by implication, this particular demand, he still felt the necessity of making it an independent demand of his party. It is still more surprising that such a demand should have been considered for inclusion in the Constitution of the State. The adding of this demand to the eight demands of the Jamaat-i-Islami removes the veil from its so-called religious structure and establishes the fact that it had no other object than to overthrow the Government and to seize power for itself. The leader of Jamaat-i-Islami thought that the rejection of such a demand and similar demands will afford an occasion to his party to inflame the masses against the Government and thus to render the task of the Government difficult. The idea was to create difficulties for it so that it should do no constructive work. The problems which faced the Government were too difficult of solution even otherwise; so to incite the masses against it and at the same time to create obstacles for it could only be motivated by a desire to accelerate the process of disintegration of the State.

21. In October 1951, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan was murdered at Rawalpindi and this served as a fillip for the Ulema for pushing forward their programme of establishing their own Government and vilifying the Ahmadiyya Community. The extracts of speeches

as reported in the press during this period delivered by the Ulema are attached to this statement as Appendix "B". The temper of these speeches leaves no room for doubt that the issue which was being forced on the Government was either to exterminate the Ahmadis or to send them in exile or to force them to objure their faith. There can be no manner of doubt that no Government worth the name could concede such demands nor could any civilised Government look with equanimity on activities of this character. But unfortunately this is precisely what the Provincial Government at that time did. A section of the press with a view to inciting the people against Ahmadis had the licence to abuse the Community in the foulest language and to make life extremely uncomfortable and difficult for them. It is significant to note in this connection that papers which were edited by non official bodies did not carry on propaganda against the Community at this critical period and it was left mainly to Government sponsored papers or semi-official papers to carry on the pernicious propaganda of maligning the Community. The simple question is that in not interfering with these unlawful activities it could be predicated of the Provincial Government that it did not intend to stop the natural results which such a propaganda was to produce. As already noted the first manifestation on a large scale of these nefarious activates were the much to be regretted incidents at Multan which made the lives of the Ahmadis there extremely miserable and which resulted in the loss of *much* property and the dislocation of their economic life. Yielding to mob clamour against the official who put down the disturbance at Multan the Provincial Government set up a Court of Inquiry. This step made police officials nervous and the Ahrar seized upon that opportunity and taking full advantage of the fear-complex of the police they started lawlessness at Lyallpur. The Ahmadies suffered great loss. The incidents connected with

the disturbances at Lyallpur are mentioned in Appendix "E" wherein these facts are placed in detail.

22. For proper appreciation of the Ahmadiyya-Ahrar controversy the Anjuman has described in some detail the activities of the Ahrar and briefly also those of the Jamaat-i-Islami in the pre-partition period. This survey will be incomplete if the activities of the Ahmadis for the same period are not placed before this Honourable Court. The Anjuman can state with full confidence that throughout its history the Ahmadiyya Community has never lost an opportunity to put in its best efforts in the cause of Islam and the Muslims. There have been many occasions when it was put to a test but there has not been a single instance which the Anjuman can recall when it did not rise fully to the occasion and exert itself to the utmost of its capacity in the service of Islam and the Muslims. Some instances are given below.

23. In the year 1923 the Arya Samajists launched on a very large scale a Shudhi campaign to convert Muslims to their creed in parts of the U.P. Their efforts met with considerable success, and Muslims all over India were considerably perturbed over this. On this occasion the Ahmadiyya Community set up their Tabligh headquarters at Agra and its zealous volunteers came out in hundreds and in a very short time succeeded in completely stemming the tide of Shudhi. It was acknowledged by the *sane* elements of the Muslims of the period that the Community which really succeeded in putting down the Shudhi activities of the Arya Samajists and in fact turning the scales against them was no other than the Ahmadiyya Community.<sup>36</sup> Even the Founder of the Ahrar Party Ch. Afzal Haq expressed himself in the following language:-

<sup>36</sup> Zamindar, 24.6.23, Zulfiqar, Lahore 16.1.24.

"مسلمانوں کے دیگر فرقوں میں تو کوئی جماعت تبلیغی اغراض کے لئے پیدا نہ ہو سکی۔ ہاں ایک دل مسلمانوں کی غفلت سے مضطرب ہو کر اٹھا۔ ایک مختصر سی جماعت اپنے گرد جمع کر کے اسلام کی نشر و اشاعت کے لئے بڑھا۔ اگرچہ مرزا غلام احمد کا دامن فرقہ بندی کے داغ سے پاک نہ ہوا۔ تاہم اپنی جماعت میں وہ اشاعتی تڑپ پیدا کر گیا۔ جو نہ صرف مسلمانوں کے مختلف فرقوں کے لئے قابل تقلید ہے بلکہ دنیا کی تمام اشاعتی جماعتوں کے لئے نمونہ ہے" (فتنہ ارتداد اور پولیٹیکل قلابازیاں مصنفہ چوہدری افضل حق ص 46)

24. In 1927 the top ranking leaders of both the Hindu and Muslim communities in the pre-partition India called a Conference to consider ways and means by which future conflicts could be avoided and some measure of unity attained between them. This conference was necessitated by reason of the high tension which prevailed between the two Communities over the 'Rangeela Rasool' and "Vertaman" cases. The Head of the Ahmadiyya Community was specially invited to take part in the proceedings. This Conference was presided over by Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah as he then was. The Head of the Ahmadiyya Community made a substantial contribution to the deliberations of that Conference and his services in that direction were greatly appreciated.<sup>37</sup> In 1930 All Parties Muslim Conference was held at Shimla in which tentative proposals for consideration at the Round Table Conference which was to be held in England were examined. The constitution of the country was on the anvil and the major parties were naturally anxious to see that their rights were secured in the Constitution. On this occasion also the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community attended these Conferences at the joint request of Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan and Malik Feroze Khan Noon and made suggestions for the protection of Muslim rights in the Constitution that was to be framed. His opinions were much respected<sup>38</sup> by Muslim intelligentsia and were

<sup>37</sup> Hamdard Delhi, 26.9.1927.

<sup>38</sup> The Inqilab, 16.7.30.

reflected in some measure in the Government of India Act of 1935.

25. In 1930 an unfortunate incident occurred in Kissa Khani Bazar in Peshawar when many innocent Muslims were shot dead. The Head of the Community helped them in every way. The activities of the Ahmadiyya Community in the Kashmir Movement in the year 1931-32 have already been referred to. Suffice it here to say that on that occasion for over two years the Community concentrated its best attention on helping sincerely the downtrodden Muslims of Kashmir. The latter were being prosecuted in hundreds and had absolutely no means to defend themselves. Dozens of Ahmadi lawyers volunteered themselves to render legal assistance. For the inquiry Commission which was presided over by Mr. Middleton I.C.S. to investigate the cause of the disturbances Ahmadi lawyers collected all the necessary material and also represented the Muslim case before that Commission. In connection with the Glancy Commission also responsible leaders of the Community assisted the Kashmiri Muslims in formulating their demands and presenting them before it. But for the help rendered by the Community the Muslim case would have gone by default. The Kashmir awakening which followed the incidents of the year 1931 can be almost fully attributed to what the Ahmadiyya Community was able to do on that occasion. In 1946 there were disturbances in Bengal and Bihar in which Muslims suffered heavily. The Community offered a sum of Rs. 15,000/- which was duly acknowledged by the Qaid-i-Azam. The Community spent another sum of Rs. 10,000/- for providing medical aid, etc. The Community also sent workers to render personal help to those in distress.

26. These instances throw some light on the fact that the Ahmadiyya Community has always been anxious to help the Muslim cause with all its resources. The activities of the Com-

munity about the time of Partition and immediately after have already been mentioned and need not be repeated here. It may be added here that at Amritsar in 1947 the Community helped the local Muslims by supplying them such equipment as they badly needed to defend themselves and also provided legal aid for such Muslims as were being prosecuted at that time. The Muslims of Amritsar warmly appreciated these services.

27. The greatest service which the Community could justly claim to have rendered to the State was its propaganda which introduced this infant State to many outside countries of the world. The Community, it may be said, has branches all over the world and in almost every important country its representatives worked hard to make the new State known and respected. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the Ahmadiyya Community has missions in about fifty foreign countries having converted nearly thirty two thousand non-Muslims to Islam and built 232 mosques in different countries. But to revert to our subject it would be useful to state that the goodwill mission sent out from Pakistan abroad included a well-known Muslim leader Mr. Hatim Alvi *from* Karachi. On his return from that good-will mission, in a letter to the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, he expressed his gratitude for the services rendered by the Ahmadiyya Community in this direction.

28. It may perhaps be thought that in counting the services that the Ahmadiyya Community had rendered to the Muslim cause in pre-partition India the Anjuman is laying claims which could not be substantiated. In point of fact however Muslim India has always referred to the activities of the Community in extremely laudatory terms. The extracts (given in Appendix C) from the various Muslim Journals of India and opinions expressed by highly placed Muslim public men and non-Muslim writers and

publicists will bear out the claim of the Anjuman that Ahmadis have always truly striven to serve Islam and the Muslims and that they have achieved unprecedented success in this sphere. These extracts show that the only Movement which really mattered in pushing forward the cause of Islam in the whole world and counteracting anti-Muslim activities is the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam.

29. This brief survey of the activities of the Community and their appreciation by the Muslims and non-Muslims in India and abroad is a clear indication of their considered attitude towards the Community. There have been no important deliberations during the period under review wherein *in* matters of common interest responsible Muslim leaders did not treat the Ahmadiyya Community as a part, and for that matter an important part, of the Muslim Community. The opinion of the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community was respected and followed as being in the best interests of the Muslims of India. Some of the self-same leaders of Pre-partition Muslim India are now pitted against the Community. It could not be on religious grounds, for the views held by the Community are just the same they held when their services were warmly appreciated. The Anjuman is not aware of the fact that these gentlemen were ever unacquainted with the tenets which the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community has held for the last 65 years. The previous history of the Community leaves no room for honest doubt that it always actively attached itself with all those activities which were intend to sponsor and espouse the cause of Islam and of Muslims. There will not be found even a single instance where the Community had not treated all those who professed to be Muslims as Muslims in matters of common interest. In fact the Head of the Community always advocated with considerable vehemence that the disunited Muslims will



continue to suffer unless they could be persuaded, in matters of common interests, to present a united front.

30. The revered Head of our Community addressed the All Muslim Parties Conference in the following words in 1925:-

“At the very outside I should point out that the leaders of All Muslim Parties Conference can never succeed in achieving their object unless they understand and convert all Muslims to this point of view that there are two definitions of Islam in this age. One is religious and the other political. The religious definition can only be according to the conscience of every individual. He may define Islam as is in accord with his own sense and understanding and hold a view accordingly. This can not form the basis of a legitimate grievance, for this is a right which one must concede to every individual. The other definition is political and no individual or sect professing Islam can lay down this definition for itself. It is done and can be done by those who disavow Islam. Who, then, is a Muslim in the Political sense? The answer to this question cannot be given by Deoband, Qadian, Farangi Mahal, Golra or Alipur. It is only Hindus, Christians and Sikhs who can answer this question. It is indeed only they with whom Muslim have to deal politically that can give an answer to this question. If a Community or people are called and treated as Muslims by the followers of other faiths the Fatwas of even a lakh of Maulvis cannot eliminate them from the body politic of Islam. The Sunnies may call the Shias as Kafirs and the Shias may call the Sunnies as Kafirs, but what has to be seen is as to how will the Hindus and Sikhs treat the Shias and Sunnies. Will the Hindus treat the Sikhs and Sunnis differently because the one calls the other a Kafir? No. They will treat the one just as the other. For their political interests are identical. The word Islam covers all. If

Muslims do not understand this point the other people will finish them up one by one and they will wake up only when it will be no use.”<sup>39</sup> In other words whatever the real definition of Islam be in the opinion of the various sects the apparent definition of Islam is and must remain no other than the declaration of belief in the Kalima i.e. “There is no God but Allah and Muhammad (Peace and blessings of God be on him) is His Prophet.”

31. To continue the narrative the Ahrar-cum-Islami Jamaat and some Ulema who were craving for power put their hands together to think of unconstitutional ways and means by which the issue could be forced upon the Government. As already submitted the normal presumption is that the Provincial Government was fully cognisant of what was actually happening and of the activities that the enemies of peace pursued. Secret Conferences were being ceaselessly carried on in the mosques and other places and above all the Government was cognisant of the result of these activities which earlier culminated in the disturbance at Multan and also of the ugly situation which was created in the city of Lyallpur. It is difficult to presume that the Provincial Government was not aware of the situation and did not know in what direction its duty lay. Still it looked on with complacency. The inescapable inference from the way it reacted to these activities is that not only did it not like to stop these activities but also that these activities had its active sympathy and moral support. The Ulema also met the Premier of Pakistan at Karachi some time in July and then again in August 1952, and pressed in unmistakable terms the same demands. The Anjuman regrets that even the then Central Government did not come up to its expectations and their attitude emboldened the Ulema still further.

<sup>39</sup> The Alfazl, Qadian, dated 18.7.25.

32. The Central Government was perhaps of the view that the maintenance of law and order was the primary duty of the Provincial Government and therefore it was not called upon to take any direct steps to put down the agitation. On the 22nd of January, 1953, the Ulema decided to fix the time-limit by which the Central Government must concede their demands, failing which they would launch "Direct Action". A council of Action was also set up to implement this decision. The proceedings of the Council of Action were widely published both in the press and from the platform. Jamaat-i-Islami was also very active in cleverly fanning the flames of unrest and agitation. On the 30th of January, 1953, in a public meeting which was held outside Mochi Gate, Lahore, Maulana Abul Aala Mamudi said that if the demands of the people were not accepted the matter very possibly would assume more serious form than the Hindu Muslim disturbances of 1947.<sup>40</sup> The reference to Hindu Muslim Disturbances described by the Maulana is too patent to be missed. The Ahrar Mujahids or *the* so-called warriors of Islam signed the recruiting forms with their blood.<sup>41</sup> The Government still looked on. However the time expired on the 26th of February 1953 and the Direct Action started at Karachi. The residence of the Prime Minister was besieged and stoned. It was at that time that the realization of the gravity of the situation dawned on the Central Government and they announced that these groups were in alliance with the enemy and that they had donned the cloak of religion only as a ruse.

33. It may now be briefly stated that in this connection representations were made by the Ahmadiyya Community both to

<sup>40</sup> The Kausar, 1st Feb. 1953. The Azad, 31.1.53.

<sup>41</sup> The Azad, dated 8.2.53.

the Central Government and the Provincial Government on various occasions, apprising both the Governments of the ugly situation which was developing. These representations, cover the entire period of the anti-social and unlawful activities of the Ahrar and the Islami Jamaat and their allied groups. The letters addressed by the Anjuman and branches are appended to this written statement as Appendix "D" for the perusal of this Honourable Court of Enquiry.

34. Ahmadiyya Deputations also waited upon the officials of the two Governments. Similarly branches of the Anjuman in various places, faced with an alarming situation repeatedly contacted local officials and apprised them of the situation and sought their help. They were shown oral sympathy but generally no action was taken to help them. The danger continued to develop and it appeared that at any moment there would be a conflagration. As our interview with responsible officials of the Provincial Government had borne no fruit a deputation of the members of the Ahmadiyya Community ultimately waited on the then Chief Minister of the Punjab on 24th February, 1953. To the amazement of the deputation he expressed the extraordinary view that he would take no action regarding anything said and done in a mosque and that he would not take any risk and expose himself to the censure of the Centre. The details of this interview are mentioned in Appendix "E".

35. The situation grew worse day by day, and the incidents connected with Lahore which are described hereinafter bring out clearly the logical result of the policy here-in-fore pursued. Incidents connected with the other storm centres viz Lyallpur, Rawalpindi, Montgomery, Sialkot, Gujranwala and Rabwah including losses incurred by the members of the Ahmadiyya Community and attempts made to forcibly make them renounce

their faith are given in Appendices “F”, “G” & “H”.

36. In Lahore this agitation took a very ugly form. Processions were taken out and the processionists shouted the most filthy abuse and slogans against the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Community and its present leaders. Threats were shouted to the members of *the* Ahmadiyya Community to the effect that they would be massacred, their property looted and their women folk abducted. Alarming reports of impending danger were received from all quarters of the city. During the 48 hours preceding the promulgation of Martial Law local Ahmadis constantly rang up 2301, the residence number of the local Amir of the Jamaat, for help. These calls led to an attempt on the part of those who received the telephonic messages to contact the relative police stations for securing these Ahmadis some measure of protection. The load on this number could be assessed by the fact that the bill for local calls for the period came to Rs. 162/12/-. All these efforts bore no fruit. No help was available from any quarter.

37. The Police Officials had been compiling lists of all the Ahmadis residing in Lahore within the jurisdiction of police stations apparently to create an impression that they were doing so in order to protect their lives, honour and properties but these very lists seem to have been utilised by the rioters for singling out the residences of Ahmadis for arson, loot and murder. While passions were at their height and law and order had been reduced to a nullity in Lahore during the first week of March 1953 some thousands of Muslims under the leadership of Maulana Abdus Sattar Niazi (now a convict in the Central Jail Lahore) entrenched themselves in the Wazir Khan Mosque, *where-from* processions used to emerge and roam about in different parts of Lahore. On the evening of the 5th and *the* morning of the 6th a proclamation was broadcast on the authority of the Provincial Government that

they had accepted the demands of the agitators and that instructions had been issued to the Military and Police not to use violence against them. It was also announced that a minister of the Provincial Government was being dispatched by air to Karachi in order that the Central Government may be persuaded to accede to the so-called demands.

38. This proclamation destroyed even that vestige of law and order which was already on the point of collapsing and reign of terror was let loose against members of the Ahmadiyya Community residing in Lahore. On the morning of the 5th Master Manzur Ahmad, an Ahmadi residing in Baghbanpura, was stabbed to death. On the 6th Mistri Mohammad Shafi popularly known as Burmawala was done to death in Ganj, Moghalpura, and Jamil Ahmad, son of Mistri Nazar Mohammad, a student of the Second Year Class of *the* T.I. Collage, Lahore, was stabbed inside Bhati Gate and murdered. Mirza Karim Beg another Ahmadi was stabbed on the Fleming Road and it is reported that whilst he was still alive he was put on top of some wooden furniture and burnt to death. On the night between the 6th and 7th an attack was made by a mob on the house of M. Abdul Hakim (proprietor of the Pioneer Electric and Battery Station McLeod Road) situated in Ganj, Moghalpura and his old mother was murdered. Friday the 6th March 1953 was a red-letter day in the history of Lahore. From early in the morning murderous attacks began to be made on Ahmadis to some of which reference has been made above and houses and shops belonging to Ahmadis were looted and set on fire. The furniture and belongings of about 43 houses and shops were reduced to ashes and property worth over 12<sup>1/2</sup> lakhs was destroyed. Prominent among those who suffered thus are Pak-Rays, and Shifa Medico near Chowk Gowalmandi on top of Nisbet Road, Orsuko on the Mall, opposite Lloyds Bank, M.

Moosa and Sons, and the Rajput Cycle Works in Nila Gumbad, the Timber yards and godowns of Malik Mohammad Tufail and Malik Barkat Ali on Ravi Road and the house of Malik Abdur Rahman on Mason Road. Within a very short time the belongings of five Ahmadiyya houses on Mozang and Temple Road, including that of Sh. Noor Ahmad, Advocate were looted and burnt. Begum Mir Mohammad Ishaq, widow of a maternal uncle of the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community was an indoor patient in the Mayo Hospital. She was in a very serious condition so much so that food could only be administered to her through a tube inserted through the abdomen into the stomach. A violent mob entered the hospital compound and an attack on her was apprehended. It was with great difficulty that she could be removed through the back door and her life saved.

39. At about one O'clock the residence of Sh. Bashir Ahmad Advocate, local Amir Jamaat Ahmadiyya, Lahore, on Temple Road was made the target and processions from different sides converged towards it hurling abuse and vituperation against the Founder and leaders of the Ahmadiyya Community as also against the said Sheikh Bashir Ahmad. News by telephone and by messenger had already had been pouring in at the residence of Sh. Bashir Ahmad, of attacks on members of the Ahmadiyya Community as well as of the looting of their properties throughout the town, and Sheikh Bashir Ahmad, as already submitted, continued sending out appeals to various Police officials. Having failed to get help and redress through the telephone he along with Malik Ghulam Farid M.A. went to the Charing Cross Police Station personally but was plainly told by the Police Officer on duty that the situation had gone completely out of hand and that they could do nothing to help them. At about 3 O'clock a strong mob gathered outside the house of Sh. Bashir Ahmad. Some of them

even entered its compound and made more than one attempt to set the house on fire.

40. Some members of this crowd even went on the top of Lady Abdul Qadir's neighbouring house and from there pelted stones, and petrol was also thrown on Sheikh Bashir Ahmad's house but luckily the fire soon got extinguished. The situation became so ugly that the inmates of the house had to fire in the air and on the hostile crowd in self defence. It was only after this that the crowd disappeared and the lives of those who had taken refuge in this house were saved from the fury of rioters.

41. A strong mob of rioters also made an attack in the forenoon of March 6 on the Ahmadiyya Jamia Mosque situated in the lane off the Circular Road outside Delhi Gate and threatened to put it on fire and burn alive Maulvi Abdul Ghafoor H.A. and his family residing in the house attached to the mosque. That they did not do so was not due to better sense having prevailed but because the mosque is surrounded on all sides by houses and Ihtas contiguous to the walls thereof and once the fire were started it would have burnt the whole locality down to earth. It was because of this feeling of self interest that some residents of the locality came and demonstrated with the rioters, who very reluctantly retreated abusing and holding out violent threats of dire consequences to all Ahmadis.

42. The exhaustive list and details of properties belonging to Ahmadis which were either looted, burnt or otherwise destroyed has been given in Appendix "F".

43. Some members of the Ahmadiyya Community were also threatened with death and loss of property if they did not renounce connections with the Ahmadiyya Community. Some of these were members of the Community residing in the village Shahdara near Lahore and amongst them were Hakim Mukhtar Ahmad and several



others. In Lahore itself Mohammad Azim of Ganj Moghalpura was also treated in the same fashion and so was Hakim Abdur Rashid from inside Bhati Gate and some other Ahmadis residing in Bharat Nagar also. Abdul Majid of M. Moosa & Sons, Nila Gumbad was also forced to recant and after he had done so a poster under the signatures of the Imam of the local mosque was put up announcing that as he had renounced Ahmadiyyat his property was sancrosanct and should not be looted or destroyed. It may be stated here that an hostile and violent mob made an attack on the shop and houses occupied by the members of the family of M. Moosa and their residences as well as shop and Godown situated in Nila Gumbad were looted and burnt. It was with very great effort that the women-folk and children could be virtually snatched out of this death trap.

44. In connection with the loss of property it may be mentioned that Sheikh Noor Ahmad Advocate, Members of the family of M. Moosa and Hafiz Abdul Jalil could give an eye witnesses account of the looting and destruction of their property. The total loss suffered by the members of the Ahmadiyya Community in the shape of destruction of property in Lahore town goes over 12 lacs and a quarter, details of which are given in Appendix 'F'.

45. The Anjuman have little doubt that the Civil Administration was completely paralysed, and but for the promulgation of Martial Law loot, arson and murder would have been committed on a very much larger scale.

46. One wonders that inspite of the severest persecution to which the Community was being subjected, and the ordeal it was facing at the time on the 19th of March, 1953, the Punjab Government considered it necessary to serve a notice on the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community under the Public Safety Act not to make any statement with regard to the Ahrar-Ahmadiyya

Controversy. On the other hand the Jamaat-i-Islami remained free to malign the Community as it liked whereas the Ahmadiyya Community was restrained from acquainting the world with the true situation. This further encouraged and exasperated the public against the Ahmadiyya Community. The members of the Jamaat-i-Islami also tried to poison Government officials against the Ahmadiyya Community *by freely distributing anti-Ahmadiyya literature* among them. The situation grew still worse when the Daily Alfazl, the only official organ of the Community, was also banned, and a situation was created wherein all sorts of rumours were spread against the members of the Ahmadiyya Community, depriving them of all means to contradict those rumours. In other words the Ahrar, the Islami Jamaat and the allied bodies were all out to exterminate the Ahmadis and at the same *time* the Government seemed determined to gag the legitimate activities of the Ahmadiyya Community in order to create an impression that it was neutral and was keeping a proper balance.

47. It is unfortunate that our opponents should have chosen to falsely accuse the community as if it does not acknowledge the Holy Prophet of Arabia (on whom be peace) as Khataman-Nabiyeen. Belief in that doctrine is a cardinal article of faith of the Ahmadiyya Community about which there can be no doubt. But assuming for the sake of argument that there exists a difference then even if this difference relates to the interpretation of the doctrine and not the doctrine itself, it is difficult to understand the logic on which our opponents' present opposition is based. One can, of course, have a legitimate grievance if one is forced to hold a view which is not acceptable to one but it is difficult to understand *what* grievance an individual can have if another person honestly holds a belief, and professes that he holds it. Approached from whatever angle the conclusion is irresistible

that religion has come in the picture for exploitation of the worse kind. The demand virtually boils down to this that the Ahmadis should not be permitted to hold any belief which is different from the belief which the agitators hold.

48. The Anjuman have respectfully placed its point of view before this Court of Inquiry that the agitation was, in fact, political in character and that religion was employed merely *as* a weapon and a disguise to seize political power. The religious weapon employed, as mentioned above, was that, God forbid, the Ahmadiyya Community does not believe in the Khatam-i-Nabuwwat of the Holy Prophet of Arabia, (on whom be peace). The merits *or* demerits of the religious belief of any community in their nature cannot form the subject of adjudication by a court. The belief of a man could be ascertained by his own profession. Once the State proceeds to find out whether the profession of an individual that he subscribes to a particular faith is or is not sound it enters on a domain which must set one sect against the other, and the disintegration of the State is the inevitable consequence. The Anjuman therefore entertains no doubt that it is not at all necessary for it to address any arguments to this Hon'ble Court on this aspect of the case. Since, however, the weapon employed has been ostensibly religious it becomes necessary to briefly state its nature so that the submission of the Anjuman regarding relevant facts should become complete. The Anjuman, however, must guard against any possible misconception *that such an attempt involves any admission on its part that this could assess the merits of the religious controversy* involved. As false and malicious propaganda against us had persistently been going on without an authoritative answer on our part for the simple reason that the Community had not the necessary facilities to represent its point of view which were available to its opponents, it was considered

necessary by the Community to declare in a formal manner their religious beliefs so that there should remain no mistake or misunderstanding about it. In order to make this declaration fully representative of the views of the community, a meeting of the Majlis-i-Mushawarat was called at Rabwah and was attended by the accredited representatives of the various branches of the Anjuman and was presided over by the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community himself. As a result of its deliberations a formal declaration was drawn up which had the concurrence of the Head of the Ahmadiyya Community and this declaration was published in the press. The relevant portion of the declaration by which, formally and in a most solemn manner, the Ahmadiyya Community declared its religious beliefs is reproduced below for the information of this Hon'ble Court.

"AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY CHIEF'S DECLARATION.

Rabwah, June 15(A.P.P.) Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, has issued the following declaration at the request of the Ahmadiyya Majlis-i-Mushawarat held here on May 15, 1953.

"In the name of Allah, the Gracious the Merciful.

"We hold that God, the All-Powerful is the Ruler of this Universe, that He is everlasting and has no equal. We firstly believe that Islam is the only true religion and that the Holy Quran is God's own revealed book. We also believe in the angels, the revealed Scriptures, the advent of Prophets, the Resurrection and in the 'Taqdeer' of good and evil as taught in the Holy Quran.

"We regard the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of God be upon him) as the greatest of all Prophets and as 'Khataman-Nabiyyeen' and we believe that the law revealed to him is the last divine law for mankind which, *let* alone any human

being having the power to change, even Almighty God himself has declared, He shall not alter. None of its commandments shall undergo change unto the Last Day and all its commandments with their attendant conditions will remain binding till the Day of Judgement.

“Next to the Holy Quran we look upon the continuous “Sunna” and the authentic sayings of the Holy Prophet as binding upon us and we regard it a sin to depart even a tittle from them. We consider the companions of the Holy Prophet and Holy members of his household as a splendid example of the teachings of the Holy Quran and the excellences of the Holy Prophet. He who forsakes their way indeed forsakes the way of God. We offer the same Prayers, keep the same Fasts, pay the same ‘Zakat’ and preform the same Pilgrimage and look upon the same ‘Qibla’ as the religious centre and place of resort for all Muslims as taught by the Holy Quran, the ‘Sunna’ and the Hadis’ of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him) and the saying of his companions.

“We regard ourselves as a part of the “Ummat” of the Holy Prophet and so was the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. He too recited the ‘Kalima’ of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of God be upon him) and we Ahmadis also recite the same ‘Kalima’ and he who does not do so is, in our opinion, a contravener of the teachings of the Holy Quran and a denier of Islam.

“We look upon every person who recites the same ‘Kalima’ and faces the same ‘Qibla’ as belonging to the ‘Ummat’ of the Holy Prophet and as a part of it.

“We regard the service of, and sympathy with, all mankind, particularly the service of Muslims and sympathy with them regardless of the country in which they live and the sect to which

they belong as our religious duty. We have always acted upon this principle and shall, with the help of God, continue to act upon it in future.

“It has been our constant endeavour to maintain good relations and tolerant attitude towards all men in general and all Muslims in particular and we shall, by the grace of God continue to do so in future and will keep away from all things likely to create unrest and will try that no wrong step on our party should create excitement in the minds of men.” (The Civil & Military Gazette, Lahore, dated 17.6.53)

49. The Anjuman respectfully submits that the Ahmadiyya Community is a purely religious body and has nothing to do *with* politics. It has always been under stress of necessity that at times it has interested itself in politics. Left alone the Community has no other desire than to propagate Islam and convince the world that its salvation lies in the acceptance of Islam. Since, however, the Community has been ostensibly assailed on religious grounds it has been necessary to state above its beliefs and tenets in spite of the fact that this Hon’ble Court will not adjudicate on this aspect of the matter. That the religious beliefs and tenets of a community are not a matter for adjudication by a Court has been aptly put by the Hon’ble Mr. Justice Coldstream in the well known case of the Ahrar leader Syed Ataullah Shah Bokhari:

“The merits and demerits of the Qadiani beliefs were not and could not in this case be a matter for the Courts considerations” (No. 182 and No. 225 of 1935 decided by the High Court on 11.11.35)

In stating the religious beliefs of the Community, therefore, the Anjuman has in view only the desire to acquaint this Hon’ble Court with what the Community professes so that this Honourable Court may be in a position to appreciate the political weapon

which is being employed in the garb of religion.

50. The Anjuman cannot conclude this statement without emphasising the vital implications of this inquiry. Religion, as stated above, has been used as a weapon in a purely political issue. Instead of leaving to the individual conscience of a man it is being made a means of gaining political power and for reasons which can do no credit to *any* nation. The Mulla is playing his role on the assumption that he is competent to declare anyone to be a Muslim or a Kafir and get him treated accordingly. The process, if pressed to its logical conclusion will, God forbid, spell ruin to the entire State. If on the basis of the decree passed by the Mulla, one Community is declared as outside the pale of Islam today, tomorrow the experiment will be repeated in the case of other sections of the Muslim Community and this process will result in the complete dis-integration of the Muslim nation. The Anjuman therefore holds the view that the enemies of the State in and outside this country have fanned the flames of religious frenzy to ruin the State. This was method tried against Muslims by the All India Congress in Pre-partition period. The Hindus probably have not given up this method of ruining Pakistan by fomenting and exploiting religious differences among the various sections of the Muslim nation and this we believe they are even now doing with the *help* of their agents. This is a matter which requires serious probing by the State. The Anjuman has not the means to establish this part of the case by placing any material before the Court on which a conclusion can be founded. It has however the moral conviction that this is so and is making this submission so that the Court of Inquiry if it so desire may be pleased to ask the State to place before it all the material in its possession which may be of help for determining this question. It may be stated that in its communique dated Feb. 27, the Government of Pakistan has

declared that the agitation is enemy sponsored.<sup>42</sup>

In the end the Anjuman earnestly prays that God may guide this Court of Inquiry in its deliberations and may assist it *in* arriving at correct conclusions so that the result of its labours may go down to history as a very *noble* effort on its part to give the State of Pakistan the right advice by which it may grow in power and fame internally and externally and thus may find an honoured place in the comity of nations: Amen.

*(Sd.) Mirza Aziz Ahmad*

President,

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan

Rabwah, Distt: Jhang.

Verification.

I solemnly affirm that the above statement is based on *information* which I believe to be correct.

Lahore

Dated 22.7.53.

*(Sd.) Mirza Aziz Ahmad.*

President,

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan

Rabwah, Distt: Jhang.

*(Sd.) Sh. Bashir Ahmad*

*(Sd.) Ch. Asadullah Khan*

Advocates for the

Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan, Rabwah.

<sup>42</sup> The Civil & Military Gazette, Lahore dated Feb. 28, 53; and dated March 1st, 53.





## II

WITNESS TESTIMONY OF  
HAZRAT MIRZA BASHIR-UD-DIN MAHMUD AHMAD<sup>RA</sup>



Witness No. 135 (Called by Majlis-i-Amal)

Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the  
Ahmadiyya Community at Rabwah, on S.A.-

To Court:

Q. Does the written statement put in this Court on behalf of Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Pakistan, Rabwah, dated 22nd July 1953, verified by Mirza Aziz Ahmad and signed by Mr. Bashir Ahmad, Mr. Asadullah Khan and Mr. Ghulam Murtaza, rightly represent the views of your community?

A. Yes, making allowance for any possible mistake due to oversight.

Q. The Court of Inquiry put some questions to your Anjuman to which Ex.D.E. 322 is a reply. Does this reply also represent the views of your community correctly?

A. Yes. This reply was shown to me and rightly represents the views of my community, but the same allowance must be made in respect of this document for any possible oversight.

Q. In reply to the statement of Maulana Abdul Ala Maudoodi, a statement was put in this Court, Ex.D.E.323. Have you seen this statement?

A. This statement was prepared after consulting me and probably I read it. Subject to the same qualification as I have mentioned in respect of the other two documents, this statement also should be deemed rightly to represent the views of the community of which I am the head.

Q. Who is a “rasul”?

A. A person deputed by Allah for a special purpose for the guidance of humanity is called a rasul.

Q. Is there any distinction between a “rasul” and a “nabi”?

A. There is no essential difference of attributes between the two.  
The same person considered from the point of view that he is

a messenger of Allah will be called a “rasul”, while from the point of view of the people for whom he brings the message, he will be called a “nabi”. Therefore, the same person would be both a “rasul” and a “nabi”.

Q. According to you, how many rasuls or nabis have appeared since Adam?

A. Nothing definite can be said on this point. The ahadis put the number at 1,20,000.

Q. Were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus rasuls?

A. There is difference about Adam, whom some believe to have been merely a “nabi” and not a “rasul”. According to me, they were all rasuls as well as nabis.

Q. Who is a “wali”?

A. One who is dear to Allah.

Q. And a “muhaddas”?

A. One to whom Allah speaks.

Q. And a “mujaddid”?

A. A person who renovates and reforms. Mujaddid is another name for a muhaddas.

Q. Can a wali, a muhaddas, or a mujaddid be the recipient of wahi?

A. Yes.

Q. How is wahi communicated to them?

A. Wahi merely means “Allah’s word”, which may be communicated to the recipient in several ways. One of the modes in which wahi is received is by the appearance of an angel before the recipient. An other mode is that the recipient hears words without seeing anyone speak to him. The third mode of the communication of wahi is “min wara-i-hijab”, (“from beyond the curtain”), namely through a vision.

Q. Can Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel) be the medium for the

- communication of wahi to a wali, a muhaddas or a mujaddid?
- A. Yes, even to persons other than those enumerated.
- Q. What can be the subject-matter of wahi in the case of a wali, a muhaddas or a mujaddid?
- A. Expression of divine love for the recipient, prediction of something that is going to happen or the clarification of the text of an earlier revealed book.
- Q. Was wahi brought to our Holy Prophet by Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel) alone?
- A. It is not correct that every wahi was brought to our Holy Prophet by Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel), but it is a fact that wahi, whether it is communicated to a nabi or to a wali, muhaddas or mujaddid, is communicated under the supervision of Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel).
- Q. What is the difference between wahi and ilham?
- A. There is no difference.
- Q. Was wahi brought to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib by Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel)?
- A. I have already said that every wahi is communicated under the supervision of Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel). One of the ilhams of Mirza Sahib shows that Archangel Gabriel (Hazrat Jibreel) appeared before him in a visible form once.
- Q. Do you believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was a nabi in the dogmatic sense?
- A. I do not know any dogmatic definition of nabi. I take a person to be a nabi who is given that appellation by Allah.
- Q. Did Allah Describe Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib as a nabi?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When did Mirza Sahib first say that he was a nabi? Please give the date and reference to his writing?
- A. He claimed to be a nabi, as far as I remember, in 1891.

- Q. Does the appearance of a nabi give rise to a new ummat?
- A. No.
- Q. Does it give rise to a new Juma'at?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Does not the belief in a new nabi affect his followers' conduct towards others?
- A. The answer to this question is in the affirmative if the nabi comes with a new shara'. If he brings no new Shara', the conduct of the followers of that nabi will be affected according to the treatment that they receive from others.
- Q. Are Ahmadis a separate class in the second sense?
- A. We are not a separate ummat but a sect ("firqa") of Muslims.
- Q. Is the first duty of an Ahmadi to his State or to the head of his community?
- A. It is a part of our creed that we should obey the Government of the State in which we live.
- Q. Before 1891, did not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib repeatedly say that he was not a nabi and that the wahi revealed to him was not wahi-i-nubuwwat but wahi-i-wilayat?
- A. He said in 1900 that till then he was of the view that a person could be a nabi only if he brought a new shara', but that Allah in one of the wahis revealed to him that this was not a necessary qualification of a nabi and that a person could be a nabi without bringing a new shara'.
- Q. Was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib ma'sum?
- A. If the meaning of the word ma'sum is that a person can never err, then nobody is ma'sum, not even our Holy Prophet. When the epithet ma'sum is applied to a nabi, the meaning is that he cannot contravene any rule of the shara' by which he is governed. In other words, he is not capable of committing any kind of sin, sagheera or kabeera, or even of acts that are

called makruhat. There have been several nabis who appeared without bringing any shariat with them. In matters not relating to shara', a nabi is liable to commit errors of judgment. In litigation between two parties, for instance, he might give a wrong decision.

Q. How you should be able to answer the question whether Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was ma'sum in any sense?

A. He was ma'sum in the sense that he could not commit a sin, sagheera or kabeera.

Q. Do you believe that on yaum-ul-hisab, Mirza Sahib will be liable to account like other mortals?

A. The presumption is that he will not be liable to account. Our Holy Prophet has said that numerous other persons, from among his ummat who are not nabis, will not be liable to account on yaum-ul-hisab.

Q. What happens to ambiya on death? Do they lie in the grave like other human beings until the yaum-ul-hisab or do they go straight to firdaus or a'raf?

A. According to my belief it is not correct that prophets on death go straight to firdaus or a'raf. It is, however, true that they are taken to a special place nearer to Allah. Since Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was a nabi, he must have been treated by Allah in a special manner and not like other Ahmadis.

Q. Do you believe that when a man dies, he is visited in his grave by Munkar and Nakir?

A. Munkar and Nakir are two angels but I do not believe that they will appear in a physical form to question the dead in the grave.

Q. Why do Munkar and Nakir come to the grave?

A. To apprise the dead man of his past conduct.

Q. Do you think that Munkar and Nakir also came to the grave



of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib?

A. I have no means of knowing this.

Q. Was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib inheritor of the divine light which Allah placed within Adam after pardoning him?

A. I know of no such theory. This phenomena is not mentioned in the Qur'an or any sahih hadis.

Q. Does Qur'an expressly predict the appearance of Messiah or Mehdi?

A. They are not mentioned by name.

Q. Are the ahadis unanimous on the appearance of Messiah and Mehdi?

A. There is no hadis indicating that there would be no Messiah. As regards Mehdi, some of the ahadis state that he will be the same person as Messiah.

Q. Are these ahadis accepted by the Muslims unanimously?

A. No.

Q. Do not these ahadis show that Messiah and Mehdi will be two different persons?

A. Yes. Some of the ahadis give that impression.

Q. According to these ahadis, which predict the appearance of Messiah and Mehdi, how long after the slaying of Dajjal and the destruction of Yajuj and Majuj, will Israfil blow his first blast?

A. I attach no importance to these ahadis.

Q. Do you believe in the ahadis relating to Dajjal and Yajuj-Majuj?

A. I will have to check these ahadis in order to be able to answer this question. Dajjal, Yajuj and Majuj are all mentioned in the Qur'an.

Q. Will the promised Messiah or Mehdi have the status of a nabi?

A. Yes.

- Q. Will they be temporal sovereigns?
- A. Not according to me.
- Q. Is there any hadith to the effect that the Messiah will repeal the rule relating to jehad or jazy'a?
- A. One hadith relates to Jazy'a, the other to harb. We prefer the hadith relating to jazy'a and we consider the other to be in explanation thereof. We do not think the actual word used (يُؤَخَّرُ) "yaze'o" means "repeal". We think it means "postponement".
- Q. Did Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib claim to be the promised Messiah and Mehdi?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Is belief in the appearance of Messiah or Mehdi an essential part of Muslim belief?
- A. Yes, in case a person realises that it is true, it is his duty to accept it.
- Q. Is din-i-Islam a politico-religious system?
- A. It is a religion system, but it contains some political injunctions which form part of the religious system and these are as binding as other rules of the system.
- Q. What is the status of the kuffar in this system?
- A. The kuffar will have the same status as the Muslims.
- Q. Who is a kafir?
- A. The words kafir, momin and muslim are relative and co-related with one another, having no definite connotations. In the Qur'an the word "kafir" is used both in relation to Allah and in relation to taghut. (طَاغُوت) So also momin is used in relation to (طَاغُوت).
- Q. Are the kuffar, namely, non-Muslims, entitled under the Islamic system to take part in law-making and administration of law, and to occupy positions involving high executive responsibilities?

- A. In my view what the Qur'an calls a purely Islamic Government is now an impossibility. According to that definition of Islamic Government it is necessary that all the Musalmans of the world should form one political unit and this in the existing circumstances is wholly impracticable.
- Q. Has there ever been an Islamic form of Government?
- A. Yes, during the Islamic Republic of Khulafa-i-Rashidin.
- Q. In that Republic what was the position of the kuffar? Could they take part in law-making in the administration of law and could they occupy positions of high executive responsibilities?
- A. This question did not arise, because during the Islamic Republic there was perpetual war between the Musalmans and the kuffar. The kuffar who were conquered acquired in the Islamic State the same rights as the Muslims. In those days, there were no elected legislatures in the form in which we have them today.
- Q. Was there a separate judiciary during the time of the Holy Prophet?
- A. The highest judicial authority in those days was the Holy Prophet himself.
- Q. In an Islamic form of Government, can a kafir have the right publicly to preach his religion?
- A. Yes.
- Q. In an Islamic State, if a Muslim, after making a comparative study of religion, honestly decides to give up Islam and to embrace another religion, say Christianity, or becomes an atheist, does he forfeit the rights of the subject of that State?
- A. Not according to me, though there are other sects in Islam who would inflict capital punishment on such a person.
- Q. If a person, after giving due consideration to the claims of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, comes to the honest conclusion

that the claim was false, does he remain a Muslim?

A. Yes. He will still be treated as a Muslim in the ordinary sense.

Q. Will God, according to your view, punish people for religious opinions or beliefs wrongly but honestly held?

A. According to me, the criterion for punishment or otherwise would be “honesty” and not “the truth of the opinion”.

Q. Is it the religious duty of the Government of an Islamic State to make all Muslims conform to all laws contained in the Qur’an and the Sunnah, including rules relating to “haququllah”?

A. The basic principle of Islam is that liability for a individual and a man is liable only for the sins that he himself commits. Therefore, if a man in an Islamic State contravenes the law contained in the Qur’an and the Sunnah, he himself is liable.

Sd/- M.Munir.  
President,

13th January 1954.

Sd/- M.R.Kayani.  
Member.

Proceedings adjourned till tomorrow.

Sd/- M.Munir.  
President.

13th January 1954.

Sd/- M.R.Kayani.  
Member.

14th January 1954.

84th Sitting

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Muhammad Munir,  
Chief Justice, PRESIDENT,  
Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.R.Kayani, MEMBER.

---

Mr. Fazal Ilahi, Advocate, for the Punjab  
Government, assisted by Mr. Ijaz Ali.

Mr. Yaqub Ali Khan, Advocate, for Mian Mumtaz  
Muhammad Khan Daultana.

Mr. Bashir Ahmad, Advocate, assisted by Messrs  
Asadullah Khan, Ghulam Murtaza and Abdur  
Rahman Khadim, Advocates, for Sadr Anjuman  
Ahmadiyya, Rabwah.

Ch. Nazir Ahmad Khan, Advocate, for Juma'at-i-  
Islami.

Mr. Mazhar Ali Azhar, Advocate, for Majlis-i-Ahrar.

Mr. Fateh Muhammad Aziz, Advocate, for  
Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-Ish'at-i-Islam.

Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, Member,  
Majlis-i-Amal.

---

Witness No.135. (called by Majlis-i-Amal):

Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the Ahmadiyya Community at Rabwah, on S.A:-

Q. You stated yesterday that liability for sin is individual suppose I am a Muslim subject of a Muslim State. I see another person doing something which is contrary to the Qur'an or the Sunnah. Is it my religious duty to stop him from such contravention, the meaning of religious duty being that if I do not stop him, I myself commit a sin?

A. Your duty is merely to advise the man.

Q. Even if I am sahib-i-amr?

A. Even then your religious duty does not require you to stop him.

Q. If I am sahib-i-amr, will it be my duty to make a temporal law making such contraventions punishable?

A. No. It will not be your religious duty but the making of such legislation will be within your discretion.

Q. Is not the denial of a true nabi kufir?

A. Yes, it amounts to kufir. Kufir is of two kinds, that which turns a person out of the millat and that which does not turn him out. Disbelief in the kalima constitutes kufir of the first kind. Kufir of the second kind is constituted by lesser heresies.

Q. Will a person who does not believe in a nabi who appears after the Holy Prophet be liable to ultra mundane penalties?

A. We consider such a person to be a sinner but whether Allah will hold him to account or not would be for Him to decide.

Q. Do you read the letter “ت” in Khatim-un-Nabiyyin with fatah or with kasr?

A. Both are right.

Q. What is the true meaning of this expression?

A. If it is read with a fatah, it means that our Holy Prophet is

an embellishment of the other prophets just as a ring is an embellishment for a person. If it is read with kasr, lexicans say that even then it will have the same meaning. It will also mean the person who brings a thing to finality. In that sense it would mean that Khatim-un-nabiyyin is the last of the prophets. In the latter case, the word a nabiyyin would mean prophets with shara', in other words tashrieenabi.

Q. In what sense was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib a nabi?

A. I have already answered this question. He was a nabi because Allah described him so in wahis.

Q. Will persons of the spiritual status of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib appear in future?

A. This is a possibility but it cannot be said whether Allah would or would not send any more such persons.

Q. Can a woman be a nabi?

A. The ahadis say that a woman cannot be a nabi.

Q. Did any women in your juma'at lay claim to that status?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Is jahanum eternal?

A. No.

Q. Is Jahannum an animal or a moving thing or a fixed place?

A. Jahanum is merely a spiritual phenomenon.

Q. Ghazali has described jahannum as if it were an animal. Is it correct?

A. It appears that this word was used in a figurative sense.

Q. Some critics of Islam have remarked that Islam as understood by an ordinary theologian perpetuates intellectual slavery inasmuch as it sends honest dissidents, however, honest, to eternal hell?

A. In my opinion Islam is the only religion which does not consider hell to be eternal.

- Q. Does it mean that Allah's forgiveness will extend to those who are not even Muslims?
- A. Certainly.
- Q. Is the modern conception of a nation, namely, citizens of a State belonging to different religions having equal political rights, known to Islam?
- A. Certainly.
- Q. What is the duty of a Muslim living under a non-Muslim Government, if that Government makes a law which is repugnant to the Qur'an or Sunnah?
- A. If the State in legislating uses powers which it should use as a State, the Muslim should obey the law. If the law is personal, for instance, if it forbids Muslims from saying prayers, then, since this is a major question, the Muslim should leave the land. If it is a minor question, as for instance, a matter that affects succession, marriage, etc., the Muslim should reconcile himself to it.
- Q. Can a Muslim be a faithful subject of a non-Muslim State?
- A. Certainly.
- Q. What is his duty, if, being in the army of a non-Muslim State, he is required to fight with the army of a Muslim State?
- A. It is for him to consider whether the Muslim State is in the right. If he considers the Muslim State to be right, it would be his duty to resign or to declare himself a conscientious objection, as is done in some countries.
- Q. Do you believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib also would be shafi in the sense in which our Holy Prophet is considered to be a shafi?
- A. No.



To Mr. Nazir Ahmad Khan, Advocate, on behalf of the Juma'at-i-Islami:-

Q. What status has “Alfazi” in your community and what is your connection with it?

A. It is true that the paper was started by me, but I gave up my connection with it two or three years later. I did so probably in 1915 or 1916. It is now owned by the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Rabwah.

Q. Was it, after 1915-16, within your power to stop the publication of this paper?

A. Yes, in the sense that the Juma'at is loyal to me and if I tell them not to purchase the paper the publication will automatically stop.

To court:-

Q. Can you advise the Anjuman to stop it?

A. I can also advise the Anjuman which own the paper to stop the publication.

To counsel (continued) :-

Q. Do you agree with the definition of momin and muslim given in answer to one of the questions put by the court to the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Rabwah?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the views expressed by you today and yesterday in any way inconsistent with those expressed in the “Introduction” of “Tashheez-ul-Azhan” for April 1911?

A. No.

Q. Do you still hold the belief expressed at page 35 of Chapter I of “A’ina-i-Sadaqat” that all those Musalmans who have not rendered bai’at to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, whether they have heard of him or not, are kafirs and outside the pale of Islam?

- A. The statement itself shows that I regard the people who are in my mind to be Musalmans. When I use the word “kafir”, I have in mind kafirs of the second kind whom I have already defined, namely, those who are not excluded from the millat. When I say they are outside the pale of Islam, I am thinking of the observation made at page 240 of “Mufradat-i-Raghib” where Islam has been described in two ways, “doonal-iman” and “fauqul-iman”. “Doonal-iman” includes Muslims whose degree is below iman. “Fauqul-iman” describes those Muslims who so excel in their faith that they are above the ordinary iman. When, therefore, I said that certain people are beyond the pale of Islam, I was thinking of those Muslims who can be placed within the definition of “fauqul-iman”. The Holy Prophet is reported in Mishkat to have said that a person who aids a tyrant and supports him is kharij from Islam.
- Q. Have you not, before the present agitation started, been describing Musalmans who do not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib to be kafirs and outside the pale of Islam?
- A. Yes. I had been saying this and at the same time had been explaining the sense in which the terms “kafir” and “kharij az da’ira-i-Islam” were used.
- Q. Is it not true that before the present agitation started you were advising your community not to say prayers after a non-Ahmadi imam, not to join funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis and not to give their daughters in marriage to non-Ahmadis?
- A. I have been saying all this in reply to similar advice being given by the ulama of non-Ahmadis, but in a lesser degree, for the reward of evil is evil of a like nature.”
- Q. You have said in your evidence now that a person who honestly does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib still remains a Muslim. Has this been your view from the very be-

ginning?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the differences between the Ahmadis and the other Muslims fundamental (“bunyadi”)?

A. If the word fundamental (“bunyadi”) carries the same sense as was attributed to it by our Holy Prophet, then the differences are not fundamental.

Q. If the word “bunyadi” is used in the ordinary sense?

A. In the ordinary sense the word conveys the meaning of “primary” but even in this sense also the differences are not bunyadi but are only furū’i.

To court:-

Q. What is the number of Ahmadis in Pakistan?

A. Between two and three lacs.

To counsel continued:-

Q. Is “Tohfa Golarvia” published in September 1902 a publication of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know or not that the belief stated in the following paragraph is the belief held by the general body of Muslims?

”جیسا کہ مومن کے لئے دوسرے احکام الہی پر ایمان لانا فرض ہے ایسا ہی اس بات پر ایمان فرض ہے کہ آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے دو بعث ہیں۔ ایک بعث محمدی جو جلالی رنگ میں ہے۔ دوسرا بعث احمدی جو کہ جمالی رنگ میں ہے۔“<sup>1</sup>

A. According to the general body of Muslims, it applies to our Holy Prophet only. According to us, it applies to the Holy Prophet Principally, but it also *applies* to Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib in a “reflected” manner.

Q. Please refer to “Alfazi” dated 21st August, 1917, at page 7, column 1 where you have discussed the differences between your juma’at and ghair Ahmadis and stated:

”ورنہ حضرت مسیح موعودؑ نے تو فرمایا ہے کہ اُنکا اسلام اور ہے اور ہمارا اور۔ اُنکا خدا اور ہے اور ہمارا خدا اور۔ ہمارا حج اور ہے اور اُنکا حج اور۔ اسی طرح اُن سے ہر بات میں اختلاف ہے۔“<sup>2</sup>

Is this correct?

- A. At the time I had no diarist and cannot, therefore, be certain that I have been correctly reported. The meaning of the passage, however, is to be taken figuratively. What is intended to convey is that we do things more sincerely.
- Q. Did you say in “Anwar-i-Khilafat” at page 93:

”اب ایک اور سوال رہ جاتا ہے کہ غیر احمدی تو حضرت مسیح موعودؑ کے منکر ہوئے اسلئے اُن کا جنازہ نہیں پڑھنا چاہئے۔ لیکن اگر کسی غیر احمدی کا چھوٹا بچہ مر جائے تو اس کا جنازہ کیوں نہ پڑھا جائے! وہ تو مسیح موعودؑ کا کفر نہیں۔ میں یہ سوال کرنے والے سے پوچھتا ہوں کہ اگر یہ بات درست ہے تو پھر ہندوؤں اور عیسائیوں کے بچوں کا جنازہ کیوں نہیں پڑھا جاتا؟“<sup>3</sup>

- A. Yes, but I said this because non-Ahmadi ulama had given a fatwa that even the children of Ahmadi should not be permitted to be buried in Muslim graveyards and in fact some of the dead bodies of Ahmadi women and children were disinterred and thrown out. Since their fatwa still holds good, my fatwa also remains in the field. We have, however, discovered a fatwa of the founder of our community according to which it is possible that after deliberation, the previous fatwa may be amended.
- Q. Is it correct that in the “Haqeeqat-ul-wahi” at page 163 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib is said to have stated:

”علاوہ اسکے جو مجھے نہیں مانتا وہ خدا اور رسول کو بھی نہیں مانتا“<sup>4</sup>

- A. Yes. These words have been used in the ordinary connotation.
- Q. What was your attitude in 1944 about the establishment of Pakistan? Is it correct that on 11th June 1944 you stated in

the “Malfuzat”:

”پاکستان اور آزاد حکومت کا مطالبہ ہندوستان کی غلامی کو مضبوط کرنیوالی زنجیریں ہیں۔“<sup>5</sup>

A. Yes, but I said so because several leading Musalmans including Maulana Maudoodi and myself were of the view that a demand for the establishment of Pakistan would make the emancipation of India more difficult. In those days Pakistan was considered to be an impossibility and the British were against creating any such state.

Q. Did you, as reported in the “Alfazi” of 5th April 1947, say the following:-

”(ا) اس لئے ہمیں کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ ہندو مسلم سوال اٹھ جائے اور ساری قومیں شیرو شکر ہو کر رہیں تاکہ ملک کے حصے بخرے نہ ہوں۔ بے شک یہ کام بہت مشکل ہے مگر اس کے نتائج بھی بہت شاندار ہیں۔

(ب) ممکن ہے عارضی طور پر افتراق پیدا ہو اور کچھ وقت کے لئے دونوں قومیں جدا جدا رہیں مگر یہ حالت عارضی ہوگی۔ اور ہمیں کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ جلد دور ہو جائے۔

(ج) بہر حال ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ اکھنڈ ہندوستان بنے اور ساری قومیں باہم شیرو شکر ہو کر رہیں۔“<sup>6</sup>

A. My speech is not correctly reported in the “Alfazi” of 5th April 1947. The correct report occurs in the “Alfazi” of 12th April 1947.

Q. Is there any Mulla in your Juma’at?

A. The word “Mulla” is another word for “Maulvi” and is not a contemptuous word. Mulla Ali Qari, Mulla Shor Bazar and Mulla Baqir who are well known figures are all called Mullas and take or took pride in it.

Q. Did you give a press interview on your return from Sind, which is reported in the “Alfazi” of 12th April 1947, and say the following in the form of a question by the pressman and your own answer to it?

”سوال۔ کیا پاکستان عملاً ممکن ہے؟

جواب۔ سیاسی اور اقتصادی لحاظ سے اس سوال کو دیکھا جائے تو پاکستان ممکن ہے۔ لیکن میرا ذاتی خیال یہ ہے کہ ملک کے حصے بخرے کرنے کی ضرورت نہیں۔“<sup>7</sup>

- A. It is correct that a correspondent put me the question of which the above words are an extract. What is stated here represented my personal opinion on the question of Partition.
- Q. Did you in your Majlis-i-Ilm-o-Irfan on the 14th of May 1947, after maghrib prayers, say the following which has been reported in the “Alfazi” of the 16th May 1947:-

”میں قبل ازیں بتا چکا ہوں کہ اللہ تعالیٰ کی مشیت ہندوستان کو اکٹھا رکھنا چاہتی ہے لیکن اگر قوموں کی غیر معمولی منافرت کی وجہ سے عارضی طور پر الگ بھی کرنا پڑے تو یہ اور بات ہے۔ بسا اوقات عضومؤف کو ڈاکٹر کاٹ دینے کا بھی مشورہ دیتے ہیں۔ لیکن یہ خوشی سے نہیں ہوتا بلکہ مجبوری اور معذوری کے عالم میں اور صرف اسی وقت جب اسکے بغیر چارہ نہ ہو۔ اور اگر پھر یہ معلوم ہو جائے کہ اس مؤف عضو کی جگہ نیا لگ سکتا ہے تو کون جاہل انسان اس کیلئے کوشش نہیں کریگا۔ اس طرح ہندوستان کی تقسیم پر اگر ہم رضامند ہوئے ہیں تو خوشی سے نہیں بلکہ مجبوری سے اور پھر یہ کوشش کریں گے کہ یہ کسی نہ کسی طرح جلد متحد ہو جائے۔“<sup>8</sup>

- A. No, I did not express my views exactly in these words and I have been substantially misreported. The man who reported my speech, namely, Munir Ahmad, was never my diarist. My true views on this subject were reported in the “Alfazi” of 21st May 1947, which are as follows:-

”ان حالات کے پیشِ نظر ان (مسلمانوں) کا حق ہے کہ مطالبہ کریں اور ہر دیاندار کا فرض ہے کہ خواہ اس میں اس کا نقصان ہو مسلمانوں کے اس مطالبہ کی تائید کرے۔ . . . . . بے شک ہمیں مسلمانوں کی طرف سے بھی بعض اوقات تکالیف پہنچ جاتی ہیں اور ہم تسلیم کر لیتے ہیں کہ شاید وہ ہمیں پھانسی پر چڑھا دیں گے۔ لیکن میں ہندوؤں سے یہ پوچھتا ہوں کہ تم لوگوں نے ہمیں کب سکھ دیا تھا تم لوگوں نے ہمیں کب آرام پہنچایا تھا اور تم لوگوں نے کب ہمارے ساتھ ہمدردی کی تھی۔“<sup>9</sup>

- Q. Did you contradict what was published in the “Alfazi” of 16th

May 1947?

A. What is stated there had already been impliedly contradicted in the “Alfazl” of 21st May 1947.

Q. What does the date “14th Hijrat” as it appears in “Alfazl” signify?

A. It signifies “14th May”.

To Court:

Q. Why do you call the month as “Hijrat”?

A. Because History records that our Holy Prophet’s hijrat occurred in May.

To Counsel contd:-

Q. Do you observe the ordinary Hijrat era or the christian calendar?

A. We have only given different names to the calendar months of the solar system with reference to various incidents in the life of the Holy Prophet.

Q. Did you claim to be declared a minority as reported in the “Alfazl” of 12th November 1946?

A. No. The facts are these. When differences arose between the Muslims and the Hindus in 1946, Government made inquiries from different communal parties, treating all the Muslims as one party. It was represented to us by some Muslim Leaguers that this was a trick played by the Britishers who had increased the number of the non-Muslim parties and had treated the Muslims as only one party. We then protested to Government as to why the Ahmadis also had not been consulted as a party. The Government replied that we were only a religious and not a political party.

Q. Did you make the following statement at one of the meetings on the occasion of the annual conference in March 1919 as mentioned in the compilation “Irfan-i-Ilahi” at page 93 under

the heading “Intiqam lene ka zamana”:

”اب زمانہ بدل گیا ہے۔ دیکھو پہلے جو مسیح آیا تھا اسے دشمنوں نے صلیب پر چڑھایا۔ مگر اب مسیح اسلئے آیا کہ اپنے مخالفین کو موت کے گھاٹ اتارے۔“<sup>10</sup>

A. Yes, but the sentence quoted is explained at pages 101 and 102 of the same book, where I have said:

”لیکن کیا ہمیں اس کا کچھ جواب نہیں دینا چاہئے اور اس خون کا بدلہ نہیں لینا چاہئے۔ لیکن اسی طریق سے جو حضرت مسیح موعود نے بتا دیا ہے۔ اور جو یہ ہے کہ کابل کی سرزمین سے اگر ایک احمدیت کا پودا کٹا گیا ہے تو اب خدا تعالیٰ اسکی بجائے ہزاروں وہاں لگائے گا۔ اس سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ سید عبداللطیف صاحب شہید کے قتل کا بدلہ یہ نہیں رکھا گیا کہ ہم ان کے قاتلوں کو قتل کر دیں اور ان کے خون بہائیں کیونکہ قتل کرنا ہمارا کام نہیں۔ ہمیں خدا تعالیٰ نے پُر امن ذرائع سے کام کرنے کے لئے کھڑا کیا ہے نہ کہ اپنے دشمنوں کو قتل کرنے کے لئے۔ پس ہمارا انتقام یہ ہے کہ ان کے اور ان کی نسل کے دلوں میں احمدیت کا بیج بوئیں اور انہیں احمدی بنائیں۔ اور جس چیز کو وہ مٹانا چاہتے ہیں۔ اس کو ہم قائم کر دیں۔ . . . . .  
مگر اب ہمارا یہ کام ہے کہ ان کے خون کا بدلہ لیں اور ان کے قاتل جس چیز کو مٹانا چاہتے ہیں اسے قائم کر دیں اور چونکہ خدا کی برگزیدہ جماعتوں میں شامل ہونے والے اسی طرح سزا دیا کرتے ہیں۔ کہ اپنے دشمنوں پر احسان کرتے ہیں۔ اس لئے ہمارا بھی یہ کام نہیں ہے کہ سید عبداللطیف صاحب کے قتل کرنے والوں کو دنیا سے مٹادیں اور قتل کر دیں۔ بلکہ یہ کہ انہیں ہمیشہ کے لئے قائم کر دیں اور ابدی زندگی کے مالک بنادیں اور اس کا طریق یہ ہے کہ انہیں احمدی بنائیں۔“<sup>11</sup>

To Court:-

Q. What does “Ahmadiyyat” in this context mean?

A. The interpretation of Islam as given by the founder of the Ahmadiyya community.

To counsel continued:-

Q. Did you see the editorial of the “Alfazi” dated 15th July 1952 under the heading ”خونی ملا کے آخری دن“ in which the following words appear:

ہاں۔ آخری وقت آن پہنچا ہے اُن تمام علماء حق کے خون کا بدلہ لینے کا جنکو شروع سے



یہ خونِ ملا قتل کرواتے آئے ہیں۔ ان سب کے خون کا بدلہ لیا جائیگا۔

(۱) عطاء اللہ شاہ بخاری سے

(۲) ملا بدایونی سے

(۳) ملا احتشام الحق سے

(۴) ملا محمد شفیع سے

(۵) ملا مودودی (پانچویں سوار) سے<sup>12</sup>

A. Yes. A complaint about this writing was made to me by a man from Montgomery and I asked for an explanation from the Nazir concerned. He informed me that he had asked the editor to contradict it.

Q. Did the contradiction come to your knowledge?

A. No, but I have just now been shown the article “ek ghalati ka izala” in the “Alfazi” of 7th August 1952 in which the writing in question has been explained.

To Court:-

Q. Had the maulvis who are described as Mullas in this editorial expressed the opinion that Ahmadis are apostates and liable to capital punishment?

A. I only know that Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi had expressed that opinion.

To counsel continued:-

Q. Did you say the following in the “Tashheez-ul-Azhan” for the month of June 1919 at page 38:

”خلیفہ ہو تو جو پہلا ہو اسکی بیعت ہو۔ جو بعد میں دوسرا پہلے کے مقابل کھڑا ہو جائے ”جیسے لاہور میں“ ہے تو اُسے قتل کر دو۔ مگر یہ قتل کا حکم تب ہے جب سلطنت اپنی ہو۔ اب اس حکومت میں ہم ایسا نہیں کر سکتے۔“<sup>13</sup>

A. No. The diarist was a novice and misinterpreted what I told him. I explained what I had actually said after the Lahore sect of Ahmadis had made a complaint to the Government and the Government had asked for an explanation from me.

Q. Is your juma'at a purely religious party or a political party as well?

A. The juma'at is primarily a religious party but it has been gifted by Allah with brains which cannot remain idle whenever a political issue comes up before it.

Q. Did you in your Friday sermon at Quetta make the speech Ex.D.E.324 as reported in the "Alfazl" dated 13th August 1948?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you mean when you said the following in this speech:

”یاد رکھو تبلیغ اُس وقت تک کامیاب نہیں ہو سکتی جب تک ہماری (BASE) مضبوط نہ ہو۔ پہلے (BASE) مضبوط ہو تو تبلیغ پھیلتی ہے۔“<sup>14</sup>

A. The words speak for themselves.

Q. And what did you mean when you said that Baluchistan should be converted to Ahmadiyyat so that at least one province can be called as our own?

A. There are two reasons for it, (1) that the grandfather of the present Nawab of Qalat was an Ahmadi and (2) that Baluchistan is a small province.

Q. Did you say the following in your Friday sermon published in the "Alfazl" of 23rd October 1948, Ex.D.E.210:

”میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ اب یہ صوبہ ہمارے ہاتھوں سے نکل نہیں سکتا۔ یہ ہمارا ہی شکار ہوگا۔ دنیا کی ساری قومیں ملکر بھی اب یہ علاقہ چھین نہیں سکتیں۔“<sup>15</sup>

A. Yes, but these words should not be taken in their literal sense. The reference here is to the future and what I intended to say was that because an Ahmadi army officer had been killed in that province, that province was bound to become Ahmadi.

Q. Is Rabwah an exclusive Ahmadiyya colony?

- A. The land was purchased by the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Rabwah and it is its property. The Anjuman has the right to deal with it in any way it likes. Some non-Ahmadis made a request for the purchase of some of the land. The Anjuman said it had no objection to having good neighbours.
- Q. Did any non-Ahmadi purchase the land?
- A. I am told that one non-Ahmadi did so, but I have no personal knowledge of it.
- Q. Where were you during the disturbances?
- A. At Rabwah.
- Q. Did any incidents like those in Lahore take place in Rabwah?
- A. No.
- Q. Have you been repeatedly saying to the members of your community that their original home is Qadian and that eventually they will go back there?
- A. Every Muslim should desire to get back his homeland.
- Q. Is there a Juma'at-i-Ahmadiyya in India?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What was the attitude of the founder of the Ahmadiyya community towards the British Government?
- A. I have already said that, according to the teachings of Islam, one has to be loyal to the Government of the country in which he lives, subject of course to the qualifications that I have already mentioned.
- Q. Is it a fact that when Baghdad fell to the British there were celebrations in Qadian?
- A. It is entirely wrong.
- Q. Would, in an Islamic State of your conception, a non-Ahmadi be eligible to hold the post of the head of the State?
- A. Yes, in a State like Pakistan, Egypt, etc.
- Q. Assuming that Pakistan is not a religious State, will it, accord-

ing to you, be possible for a non-Muslim to be the head of the State?

A. It is for the majority of the legislature to determine whether the head of the State should be a Muslim or a non-Muslim.

Q. Have you been preaching to the members of your Juma'at that they should have a mu'ashira different from the other Muslims?

A. No.

Q. Did you advise the members of your Juma'at to take hold of public offices in Pakistan?

A. No.

Q. Is the position of Rabwah singularly strategic?

A. Yes, it would be a strategic point in the hands of the Pakistan Government.

Q. Did you state in a press conference in Rabwah, as reported in the "Alfazi" of the 9th November 1948, at page 2, as follows:-

”گو یہ زمین موجودہ صورت میں واقعی مہنگی ہے۔ اور اِس میں کوئی جاذبیت نہیں ہے لیکن اللہ تعالیٰ کے فضل سے ہم اِسے ایک نہایت شاندار شہر کی صورت میں تبدیل کرنے کا تہیہ کر چکے ہیں۔ جو دفاعی لحاظ سے پاکستان میں محفوظ ترین مقام ہوگا۔“<sup>16</sup>

A. I cannot now recollect after five years what were the exact words said by me at a press conference.

To Court:-

Q. Do you think Rabwah is a strategic place?

A. Both the railway and the motor road pass through the town of Rabwah. It could not, therefore, be regarded as a place of strategic importance as against the Pakistan Government. From the point of view of other people, however, it is of strategic importance to us, as the town could not be attacked from the side of Chiniot, which is on the other side of the Chenab river.

Cross-examination by Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan  
Maikash, Member, Majlis-i-Amal:

Q. What is your opinion about the claim of Musailima Ibn-ul-Habib?

A. His claim was false.

Q. Did he recite the kalima?

A. No.

Q. Was he a Musalman?

A. No.

Q. At page 124 of “Haqiqat-ul-Wahi” it is stated:

”پھر ماسوائے اس کے کیا کسی مرتد کے ارتداد سے یہ نتیجہ نکل سکتا ہے کہ وہ سلسلہ جسمیں یہ مرتد خارج ہوا حق نہیں ہے۔ کہ ہمارے مخالف علما کو خبر نہیں کہ کئی بد بخت حضرت مولے کے زمانے میں اُن سے مرتد ہو گئے تھے پھر کئی لوگ حضرت علیؑ سے مرتد ہوئے اور پھر کئی بد بخت اور بد قسمت ہمارے نبی صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے عہد میں آپ سے مرتد ہو گئے چنانچہ مسیلہ کذاب بھی مرتدین میں سے ایک تھا۔“<sup>17</sup>

was Musailima Kazzab in your opinion a murtadd?

A. Yes. When I said he was not a Musalman, I meant that he did not remain a Musalman after he claimed prophethood.

Q. Have you read the life histories of Aswad Anasi, Sajah Nabiyyah Kazibah, Tali'a Asadi?

A. Yes.

Q. Did all these persons of whom one was a woman, lay claim to prophethood with the result that Musalmans declared war on them?

A. No. The position is quite the reverse. These persons, each of whom claimed to be a prophet, attacked the Musalmans and the Musalmans then vanquished them in return.

Q. Did the following persons lay claim to prophethood from time to time:-

(a) Haris Dimashqi – In the time of Khalifa

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Abdul Malak –                          | 695-705 A.D |
| (2) <u>Mughira bin Saeed Alajali</u> – | 724-741 A.D |
| (3) <u>Abu Mansur Alajali:</u>         | 724-741     |
| (4) <u>Ishaq Alakhras Almaghribi</u> – | 750-754     |
| (5) <u>Abu Isa Ishaq Isfahani</u> –    | 754-775     |
| (6) <u>Ali bin Muhammad Khariji</u>    | 869         |
| (7) Haameen-min-Allah Makhasi          | ?           |
| (8) <u>Mahmud Wahid Gilani.</u>        | 1586-1628   |
| (9) <u>Muhammad Ali Bab.</u>           | 1850        |
- A. Except Muhammad Ali Bab, I cannot be certain about the other names. Muhammad Ali Bab styled himself as Mehdi Mau-ud but not a prophet.
- Q. You have already pointed out the difference between tashri'ee and ghair tashri'ee nabi. Will you please define a “zilli nabi” and a “baruzi nabi”?
- A. These terms signify that the person in respect of whom they are used does not himself possess certain attributes but that he possesses them in a reflected manner.
- Q. Did Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib claimed to be a tashri'ee nabi?
- A. No.
- Q. Did not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, in “Arab'een” No. 4, at pages 83-84 say the following:-

”ماسوا اسكے يہ بھی تو سمجھو کہ شريعت کیا چیز ہے جس نے اپنی وحی کے ذریعہ سے چند امر اور نہی بیان کئے۔ اور اپنی امت کیلئے ایک قانون مقرر کیا۔ وہ ہی صاحب الشریعت ہو گیا۔ پس اس تعریف کی رو سے بھی ہمارے مخالف ملزم ہیں۔ کیونکہ میری وحی میں امر بھی ہیں اور نہی بھی ہے۔ مثلاً یہ الہام قل للہومنین یغضوا من ابصارہم ویحفظوا فروجہم ذالک ازلکی لہم۔ یہ براہین احمدیہ میں درج ہے۔ اور اس میں امر بھی ہے اور نہی بھی اور اس پر تئیں برس کی مدت بھی گزر گئی اور ایسا ہی اب تک میری وحی میں امر بھی ہوتے ہیں اور نہی بھی۔

اور اگر کہو کہ شریعت سے وہ شریعت مراد ہے جس میں نئے احکام ہوں تو یہ باطل ہے اللہ تعالیٰ فرماتا ہے۔ ان هذا الفی الصحف الاولیٰ صف ابراہیم و موسیٰ یعنی قرآنی تعلیم توریت میں بھی موجود ہے اور اگر یہ کہو کہ شریعت وہ ہے جسمیں باستیفاء امر اور نہی کا ذکر ہو تو یہ بھی باطل ہے کیونکہ اگر تورات یا قرآن شریف میں باستیفاء احکام شریعت کا ذکر ہوتا تو اجتہاد کی گنجائش نہ رہتی۔ غرض یہ سب خیالات فضول اور کوتاہ اندیشیاں ہیں۔ ہمارا ایمان ہے کہ آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم خاتم الانبیاء ہیں۔ اور قرآن زبانی کتابوں کا خاتم ہے تاہم خدائے تعالیٰ نے اپنے نفس پر یہ حرام نہیں کیا کہ تجدید کے طور پر کسی اور مامور کے ذریعہ سے یہ احکام صادر کرے کہ جھوٹ نہ بولو۔ جھوٹی گواہی نہ دو۔ زنا نہ کرو۔ خون نہ کرو اور ظاہر ہے ایسا بیان کرنا بیانی شریعت ہے جو مسیح موعود کا بھی کام ہے پھر وہ دلیل تمہاری دلیل کیسی گاؤں خورد ہو گئی کہ اگر کوئی شریعت لاوے اور مفتری ہو تو وہ تیس برس تک زندہ نہیں رہ سکتا۔“

۱۔ چونکہ میری تعلیم میں امر بھی ہے اور نہی بھی اور شریعت کے ضروری احکام کی تجدید ہے۔ اس لئے خدا تعالیٰ نے میری تعلیم کو اور اس وحی کو جو میرے پر ہوتی ہے فلک یعنی کشتی کے نام سے موسوم کیا جیسا کہ ایک الہام الہی کی یہ عبارت ہے ”واصنع الفلک باعیننا ووحینا ان الذین یشیعونک وانما یشیعون اللہ ید اللہ فوق ایدہم۔“ یعنی اس تعلیم اور تجدید کی کشتی کو ہماری آنکھوں کے سامنے اور ہماری وحی سے بنا۔ جو لوگ تجھ سے بیعت کرتے ہیں وہ خدا سے بیعت کرتے ہیں یہ خدا کا ہاتھ ہے جو ان کے ہاتھوں پر ہے اب دیکھو خدا نے میری وحی اور تعلیم اور میری بیعت کو نوح کی کشتی قرار دیا اور تمام انسانوں کیلئے اسکو مدارِ نجات ٹھہرایا۔ جسکی آنکھیں ہوں دیکھئے اور جسکے کان ہوں سنئے جمع منہ۔<sup>18</sup>

- A. Yes, but this has been explained by him in subsequent books.  
(Witness read from a book.)
- Q. Did Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib describe as murtadd those who, after becoming Ahmadi, abjured their faith?
- A. Murtadd merely means a person who turns back. Maulana Maudoodi also has used this term.
- Q. Do you include Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib among the Ma'murs whose acknowledgment is necessary in order to be

called a Muslim?

A. I have already answered this question. No one who does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib can be taken out of the pale of Islam.

Q. How many true nabis have appeared after our Holy Prophet?

A. I know of none. But in the sense that, according to a hadith of our Holy Prophet, even the ulama of his ummat reflect his glory, hundreds and thousands must have appeared.

Q. Do you believe this hadith to be correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib had a higher status than the other ambiya, excluding our Holy Prophet?

A. We prefer him only to Hazrat Masih Nasiri.

Sd/- M.Munir  
President.

14th January 1954.

Proceedings adjourned to tomorrow.

Sd/- M.R.Kayani.  
Member

14th January 1954

Sd/- M.Munir  
President  
Sd/- M.R. Kayani  
Member.



15th January 1954.

85th Sitting.

Present:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Muhammad Munir,  
Chief Justice, President.  
Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.R. Kayani, Member.

---

Mr. Fazal Ilahi, Advocate, assisted by Mr. Ijaz Ali, for the  
Punjab Government.

Mr. Bashir Ahmad, Advocate, assisted by Messrs.  
Asadullah Khan, Ghulam Murtaza and Abdur  
Rahman Khadim, Advocates, for the Sadar Anjuman  
Ahmadiyya Rabwah.

Mr. Yaqub Ali Khan, Advocate, for Mian Mumtaz  
Muhammad Khan Daultana.

Mr. Nazir Ahmad Khan, Advocate, for the Juma'at-i-  
Islami.

Mr. Mazhar Ali Azhar, Advocate, for the Majlis-i-Ahrar.

Mr. Fateh Muhammad Aziz for Ahmadiyya Anjuman-i-  
Isha'at Islam.

Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, Member,  
Majlis-i-Amal, in person.

---

Witness No.135 (Called by Majlis-i-Amal, continued):-

Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the Ahmadiyya Community at Rabwah, on solemn affirmation, continued:-

To Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, on behalf of Majlis-i-Amal:-

Q. It is the unanimous belief of the Muslims that before the Day of Resurrection Isa Ibn-i-Maryam (Jesus of Nazareth) will reappear. What is your belief on this point?

A. You are wrong in asserting that it is the unanimous belief of the Muslims. There is a section among them who believe that Jesus of Nazareth died a normal physical death. Our belief is that Isa Abn-i-Maryam will not reappear, but that another man answering to his description and possessing his attributes will appear.

To Court:-

Q. Were the jews in the time of jesus of Nazareth waiting for a Messiah?

A. Yes, they were waiting for a Messiah, but he was to be preceded by Elias who was to descend from Heaven in his physical form.

Q. Was that Messiah the same as the jesus of Nazareth?

A. Yes, according to our belief, but not according to the belief of the jews.

Q. Had Jesus of Nazareth ever claimed to be the promised Messiah?

A. Yes.

Q. The jews presented the idea of a trading GOD whom they held in monopoly in view of the promise made by GOD to Abraham to restore to them the land of Canaan. Paul's Christians claim a first mortgage on God, the consideration for the mortgage being the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth at

the Golgotha Hill. Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash and the learned divines with him claim that the first mortgage on God is theirs, the consideration for the mortgage being the surrender of intellect. Do you also claim any special or separate mortgage on God for the belief in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib's nubuwwat?

A. We admit none of the mortgages; nor do we claim any.

To Maulana Maikash (continued):-

Q. You said yesterday that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib preferred himself only to Isa Ibn-i-Maryam, but the "Alfazi" of 4th and 6th April 1915, Ex.D.E.325, purports to reproduce the following passage from Mirza Sahib's diary, dated 17th April 1902:-

”کمالات متفرقہ جو تمام دیگر انبیاء میں پائے جاتے تھے وہ سب حضرت رسول کریم میں ان سے بڑھکر موجود تھے۔ اور اب وہ سارے کمالات حضرت رسول کریم سے ظلی طور پر ہم کو عطا کئے گئے اور اسی لئے ہمارا نام آدم۔ ابراہیم۔ موسیٰ۔ نوح۔ داؤد۔ یوسف۔ سلیمان۔ یحییٰ۔ عیسیٰ وغیرہ ہے۔ چنانچہ ابراہیم ہمارا نام اس واسطے ہے کہ حضرت ابراہیم ایسے مقام میں پیدا ہوئے تھے کہ وہ بت خانہ تھا۔ اور لوگ بت پرست تھے اور اب بھی لوگوں کا یہی حال ہے۔“<sup>19</sup>

Does this not show that Mirza Sahib claimed to be better than all the prophets named in this passage?

A. Mirza Sahib kept no regular diary in those days and this passage merely purports to be a report by a certain reporter. But assuming that this is a correct report, it does not show that Mirza Sahib preferred himself to other prophets. It merely purports to reproduce the attributes which Mirza Sahib claimed to possess in common with other prophets.

Q. The general body of Muslims do not say funeral prayers for Ahmadis because the former consider the latter to be kafirs. What is your reason for not saying funeral prayers for non-

Ahmadis, apart from the reason which you have already given, namely, that you have acted in a retaliatory manner?

- A. The main reason is that which I have already given, namely that we do not say funeral prayers for non-Ahmadis because they do not say funeral prayers for Ahmadis. The proof of this assertion lies in the fact that for ten years after his claim Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib not only allowed the Ahmadis to say prayers for non-Ahmadis, but he himself joined such prayers. The second reason, which is really a part of the first, is that, according to a unanimously accepted hadith, a person who declares another to be a kafir himself becomes a kafir.

- Q. Does your previous answer also apply to the refusal to say prayers after non-Ahmadi imams?

A. Yes.

- Q. Please look at page 45 of “Alqaul-ul-fasl”, which contains the following passage:-

”اسکے بعد خدا تعالیٰ کا حکم آیا جسکے بعد نماز غیروں کے پیچھے حرام کی گئی اور اب صرف منع نہ تھی بلکہ حرام تھی اور حقیقی حرمت صرف خدا تعالیٰ کی طرف سے ہوتی ہے۔“<sup>20</sup>

Does not this passage give a different reason for your injunction that Ahmadis should not say prayers behind non-Ahmadi imams?

- A. This only means that the reason for which the Ahmadis were forbidden to say prayers behind a non-Ahmadi imam was subsequently confirmed by wahi.

- Q. You have given a different reason at page 90 of Anwar-i-Khilafat where the following passage occurs:-

”ہمارا یہ فرض ہے کہ ہم غیر احمدیوں کو مسلمان نہ سمجھیں اور انکے پیچھے نماز نہ پڑھیں کیونکہ ہمارے نزدیک وہ خدا تعالیٰ کے ایک نبی کے منکر ہیں۔ یہ دین کا معاملہ ہے اسمیں کسی کا اپنا اختیار نہیں۔“<sup>21</sup>

- A. I have already said that there is a type of kufir which does not turn a person out of the millat. Our Holy Prophet said that we should make our imam a person who is more pious than other people. Disbelief in a nabi weakens a person's piety.
- Q. You have said that “kufir” and “islam” are relative terms. Is it not correct that the words kufir, kafir, kafirun, kafireen, kuffar, alkafarato, have been used in the Qur'an only in one sense, namely, indicating persons who are outside the ummat and the pale of Islam?
- A. I have already stated that the word has not been used in the Qur'an in one sense only. Yesterday I gave an instance of it from the Qur'an itself.
- Q. Please look at page 22 of “Zikr-i-Ilahi”, which contains the following passage:-

”میرا تو یہ عقیدہ ہے کہ دنیا میں دو گروہ ہیں ایک مومن دوسرے کافر۔ اسلئے جو حضرت مسیح موعود پر ایمان لانے والے ہیں وہ مومن ہیں اور جو ایمان نہیں لائے خواہ اُنکے ایمان نہ لانے کی کوئی وجہ ہو وہ کافر ہیں۔“<sup>22</sup>

Is not the word “kafir” used here in contradiction to the word “momin”?

- A. In this context the word “momin” means one who believes and the word “kafir” means one who does not believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib.

To Court:

- Q. Is belief in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, therefore, a part of iman?
- A. No. The word “momin” here has been used merely to convey the sense of belief in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, not of belief in the fundamentals of Islam.
- Q. If the word “kufir” is likely to give rise to misunderstanding and bitterness, would it not be better either to give up using

it altogether or to use it with great caution?

A. We have been trying to avoid its use after 1922.

To Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, contd.-

Q. Have you ever used the word “ummat” in respect of your juma’at?

A. I believe that Ahmadis are not a separate ummat, but if the word “ummat” has been used in respect of them, it must be by inadvertence and indicating merely a juma’at.

Q. Please look at the “Alfazi” dated 13th August 1948, where the following passage occurs:-

”اللہ تعالیٰ نے جو کام ہمارے سپرد کیا وہ کسی اور اُمت کے سپرد نہیں کیا پہلے انبیاء میں سے کوئی نبی ایک لاکھ کی طرف آیا کوئی نبی دو لاکھ کی طرف آیا اور کوئی دس لاکھ کی طرف آیا۔ رسول کریم صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کی قوم سوا لاکھ تھی یا ہو سکتا ہے عرب کی آبادی آپ کے زمانہ میں دو تین لاکھ ہو۔ بس یہی آپ کے پہلے مخاطب تھے۔ لیکن ہمارے چھٹے ہی چالیس کروڑ مخاطب ہیں۔“<sup>23</sup>

In what sense have you used the word “ummat”?

A. Here I have used the word “ummat” to denote the ummat of the Holy Prophet.

Q. Are you not under an obligation to the British because in their reign your peculiar beliefs prospered and can you fail to continue to be grateful to them?

A. Gratitude is a moral obligation and has nothing to do with politics. It is true that we are beholden to them for the justice that they have done to everybody including ourselves.

Q. Did Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib, with a view to obliging the British, write literature against jihad bis-saif for dissemination in Muslim countries, so voluminous that it could occupy about fifty almirahs?

A. What he wrote was with a view to removing a misunderstanding which other religions had against the Muslims. It embraces

several subjects in respect of which misapprehensions existed, and incidentally it covered the subject of jihad also. To jihad itself he devoted a pamphlet of only a few pages.

- Q. Has not Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib in the following couplet claimed preference to our Holy Prophet:

له خسف القمر المنير وان لي غسا القمر ان المشرق ان اتنكر<sup>24</sup>

(For the Holy Prophet, he said, only one moon was eclipsed whereas for my sake both the sun and the moon were eclipsed.)

- A. This is merely a reference to the hadis that at the time of the appearance of Mehdi there will be an eclipse both of the sun and the moon in the month of Ramzan.

- Q. Did you ever describe the general body of Muslims as Abu Jehl and your own community as an “aqaliyyat”?

- A. It is not correct that I regard the general body of Muslims to belong to the party of Abu Jehl but it is correct that our community is small in number.

To Court:-

- Q. How many key posts in Pakistan do Ahmadis hold?

- A. I do not think anyone beyond Chaudhri Muhammad Zafarullah Khan holds any post which may be called a key post.

- Q. What is the number of Ahmadi officers in the following services:

- 1) the Air Force,
- 2) the Navy, and
- 3) the Army ?

- A. One and a half or two per cent in the Army, about five percent in the Air Force and 1 per cent in the Navy.

- Q. Is Mr. Lal Shah Bokhari an Ahmadi?

- A. No.

Q. Is General Haya-ud-Din an Ahmadi?

A. He used to be an Ahmadi but I am not sure whether he is one now.

Q. Is Mr. Ghulam Ahmad, Principal, Government College, Rawalpindi, an Ahmadi?

A. No.

Q. Was the Indonesian Ambassador in Pakistan who preceded the present Ambassador an Ahmadi?

A. He was definitely not of the Qadian Branch of the Ahmadis but I cannot say whether he belonged to the Lahore Branch. In 1953, however, the Ambassador was definitely not an Ahmadi.

To Maulana Maikash continued:-

Q. Did you say in your khutba what is reported in the “Alfazl” of 3rd January 1952, Ex.D.E.326?

A. The report substantially represents the sense of what I said though I cannot be sure of the words reported. I said all this in reply to the editorial in the “Afaq” dated 6th December 1951.

Q. In this report there is a reference to yourself or to some successor of yours being the future conqueror of Pakistan?

A. You are misreading the report. There is nothing of that kind in it.

(NOTE:- Despite our assurance that anything said by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib or by the witness or anything published in any one of the Ahmadiyya publications would be treated by the Court as independent evidence, almost all the questions which have so far been put relate to such writings. It is a sheer waste of time and we are not prepared to allow further questions on this subject.)



To Mr. Nazir Ahmad Khan (By permission of the Court):-

Q. A statement of yours was published in the “Civil & Military Gazette”, dated 23rd February 1953. Did Kh. Nazir Ahmad, Advocate, see you shortly before or after that publication.

A. Yes, he did see me one or two days before this publication.

Q. Did Kh. Nazir Ahmad see you again sometime in March, 1953?

A. Yes, he did see me a second time but I do not know the date. This must have been about a month or two after his first visit.

Q. Did he communicate to you any message from Khawaja Nazim-ud-Din, the Prime Minister?

A. No, he did not refer to Khawaja Nazim-ud-Din. He merely said that he had a talk with some important personages at Karachi. My own impression is that he had met the Governor-General.

Q. Did he mention Maulana Maudoodi?

A. No.

R.O. & A.C.

Sd/- M.Munir.  
PRESIDENT.

15th January 1954.

Sd/- M.R.Kayani.  
MEMBER.

### III

WITNESS TESTIMONY OF  
SIR MUHAMMAD ZAFARULLAH KHAN



16th January 1954.

86th Sitting.

Present

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Muhammad Munir,

Chief Justice,

President.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.R. Kayani,

Member.

---

Mr. Fazal Ilahi, Advocate, for the Punjab Government,  
assisted by Mr. Ijaz Ali.

Mr. Yaqub Ali Khan, Advocate, for Mr. Daultana.

Mr. Nazir Ahmad Khan, Advocate, for Juma'at-i-Islami.

Mr. Bashir Ahmad and Mr. Asadullah Khan, Advocates,  
for Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya, Rabwah.

Mr. Fatah Muhammad Aziz, Advocate, for Ahmadiyya  
Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam.

Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, Member,  
Majlis-i-Amal.

Mr. Mazhar Ali Azhar, Advocate, for Majlis-i-Ahrar.

Mr. Faiyaz Ali, Advocate-General, Pakistan

---

Witness No: 137 (Called by the Juma'at-i-Islami):

(IN CAMERA) The Honourable Chaudhri Muhammad Zafarullah Khan,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations,  
Government of Pakistan, on solemn affirmation:-

To Mr. Nazir Ahmad Khan, on behalf of Juma'at-i-Islami:-

Q. Did you ever bring to the notice of the Pakistan Cabinet the  
question as to how your community was being treated in  
Pakistan, and if so, when?

A. While the agitation was going on, I might have mentioned

some aspects of the question in the Cabinet, but i never asked the cabinet to discuss it as a specific subject.

Q. Did you ever bring it to the notice of the late Liaquat Ali Khan in any Cabinet meeting that you had certain complaints about the manner in which your community was being treated?

A. I have no specific recollection.

Q. Khawaja Nazim-ud-Din has said that it was in the time of the late Quaid-i-Millat that you brought it to the notice of the Cabinet that three Ahmadis had been murdered. Is that so?

A. My recollection is that in some connection or the other I had mentioned the matter to the present Governor-General who was then Finance Minister. I believe we were at that time abroad. On his return he mentioned the matter to the then Prime Minister and an inquiry might have been made in pursuance of that.

Q. To your knowledge, was there a discussion about the agitation by the Pakistan Cabinet on or about the 7th or 8th of August 1952?

A. There could be no regular Cabinet meeting if I was in Karachi and was not given notice thereof, but I believe on some occasions the Prime Minister, Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din Sahib, called some of his colleagues for consultation in respect of the agitation. On those occasions I was not called.

Q. Can you give any reason why you were not called?

A. It is open to the Prime Minister to call any of his colleagues for a discussion.

Q. Did you then, after this meeting in which you were not called, preside over a Cabinet meeting on or about the same date, that is, about the 7th or 8th August?

A. Whenever I happen to be in Karachi and the Prime Minister is not able to preside I presided over the Cabinet meetings.

- Q. When Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din was ill, did you preside over a Cabinet meeting in which certain decisions had been taken by a conference of the type you have referred.
- A. It may have happened.
- Q. Can you please recollect as to what was the subject-matter under discussion before this Cabinet meeting?
- A. All, that I remember, I could not be specific about it is that a declaration or an announcement on behalf of Government was put before the Cabinet. Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din Sahib was indisposed that morning. His Secretary or the Cabinet Secretary came to me and told me that they had called a meeting and that Khwaja Sahib would not be able to preside. About the subject-matter he said that it was a declaration that Government servants were not to use their influence or position for religious propaganda, but I do not know who had drafted it.
- Q. Did you issue a statement in respect of the Government communique of the 14th August 1952?
- A. Yes, the statement in Annexure I-A to the Home Secretary's written statement has been seen by me. It represents the correct version.
- Q. Has this statement anything to do with your speech which you delivered in the Jehangir Park on the 18th of May 1952?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you have any talk with Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din before you delivered this speech in the Jehangir Park?
- A. Khwaja Sahib mentioned to me that several people had objected to my taking part in the meeting.
- Q. Did he say anything about your intended speech?
- A. He suggested that it would be better if I did not address the meeting.

Q. What did you say?

A. I said it was embarrassing for me at that stage as my name had already been announced as a speaker, but that if I had not been in that position I would have gladly complied with his suggestion and would not have gone.

To Court:-

Q. Was this a public meeting?

A. Yes.

To counsel (continued):-

Q. Was this the first public meeting which your community held?

A. No. There had been several meetings at Rabwah and other places.

Q. Does the “Alfazi”, dated the 31st May 1952, correctly report your speech which you delivered on the 18th May?

A. Yes, substantially. The headings are not mine.

Q. Did you during your discussion with Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din tell him that you considered him a kafir from the religious point of view?

A. I do not think our conversation ever took the turn of discussing this specific question but I may have generally explained to him the doctrinal difference on that point.

Q. Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din has stated in his evidence in Court as follows:-

“I definitely remember that in the course of a discussion with him, Chaudhri Muhammad Zafarullah Khan had mentioned it to me that according to his aqida I was a kafir but that, for political, social and other purposes I could be treated by him as a Musalman.”

Did you say this?

- A. He may have himself concluded that from the explanation of the doctrinal position.

To Court:-

- Q. It is alleged that in a conversation with Maulvi Muhammad Ishaq, khatib of a mosque in Abbotabad, in August 1949 you expressed the view that you may be considered as a Muslim servant of a kafir Government or a kafir servant of a Muslim Government.

Is that correct?

- A. I doubt it very much.

To counsel continued:-

- Q. Did you tell some Lahore lawyer who met you some time back in Karachi in connection with the location of the Federal Court in Lahore, that the Court may be located in Delhi in future?

- A. No. I distinctly remember that the suggestion they put forward was that the Act might be amended so as to make Lahore the seat of the Federal Court. I said that it would not be a wise move because if any question of the amendment of the Act was taken up, it might be suggested that Dacca should become the seat of the Court, and as East Pakistan had a majority of votes in the Constituent Assembly, the suggestion might be carried. No question could arise whatsoever of the Court sitting in Delhi as it was utterly irrelevant.

- Q. Did Khwaja Nazir Ahmad meet you in March 1953?

- A. He might have.

- Q. Was there any talk between you two as to any clarification of the position of the head of the community with regard to the three demands?

- A. He mentioned to me that he had either met or intended to meet the head of the community with regard to some clari-



fications. He suggested some clarifications and asked for my opinion. I told him that I could not express any opinion and that he should discuss the matter with the head of the community.

Q. What is your position with regard to the community? Why did Khwaja Nazir Ahmad come to see you?

A. I am an ordinary member and hold no special position in the community. I do not know why Khwaja Nazir Ahmad came to consult me on this matter.

Q. Did he suggest that if the head of the community does not call the general body of Muslims kafirs in future, there may be a basis for further discussion?

A. My recollection is that he said that he and a colleague of his had already been to Rabwah and seen the head of the community and that the latter had made a statement on that subject. I do not think he made this suggestion to me. He thought that the statement which the head of the community had made cleared the position on that aspect.

Q. Did you say something?

A. No.

Q. Could you tell us as to what part of the March was this?

A. I cannot say whether it was March or April but it was about that time.

Q. Did Mr. Daultana have an interview with you in October 1952?

A. On most occasions, whenever he went down to Karachi, he came to see me.

Q. Did he in this particular meeting discuss the three demands or the agitation with regard to these demands with you?

A. I do not think we ever discussed the substance or the merits of the demands. I do not recall his having made any particu-

lar suggestion to me either with regard to the demands or the agitation, though he may have mentioned the agitation generally.

Q. It is suggested that you have taken very active interest in the matters relating to this inquiry by visiting Lahore very frequently and advising members of your community what attitude to adopt. Is it correct?

A. I have been out of the country altogether during the greater part of the Inquiry. My visits to Lahore before I went abroad had no connection with what attitude the community should or should not adopt towards the Court of Inquiry, or for the purpose of giving advice to the members of my community.

Q. Do you generally agree with the views of the head of your community regarding religious topics?

A. Yes, on strict matters of doctrine.

Q. What is the position of the head of the community? Is whatever he says on matters of doctrine law unto the members?

A. If a person does not agree with regard to that doctrine, he would declare that he is not a member of the community that accepts him as the head.

Q. Is it a fact that you did not join the janaza prayers of the Quaid-i-Azam?

A. I did not join the actual prayers though I accompanied the funeral procession. It should be remembered that the janaza prayers were led by the late Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani according to whom I was a kafir and a murtadd and should be put to death.

Q. Were you in any manner instrumental or assisting the community in obtaining the land on which Rabwah is now situated?

A. I do not think I had any occasion to take any part in the

actual negotiations for the acquisition of the land. After the land had been acquired, some difficulties of a technical kind arose and I remember I spoke to Mr. Daultana as well as to Mr. Dasti about them.

Q. Were you a member of the Muslim League before partition?

A. I was a member of the Muslim League before I become a Judge of the Federal Court in 1941. From 1935 to 1941, however while I was a Minister of the Central Cabinet, I took no active part in the League's deliberations.

Q. Did you renounce your title in obedience to the League's mandate in 1946?

A. I am not aware of any such mandate, but I have not used my title since I have assumed after Partition.

Q. There is a complaint that you have been preferring the members of your community in Government offices, whether in your own Ministry or any other departments. Is there any truth in it?

A. With regard to my own Ministry, the position is this. I make no appointments myself to the Foreign Service. All appointments to the Foreign Service are made on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission. There are, to my knowledge, four members of the Ahmadiyya community in the Foreign Service, out of a total of about eighty to a hundred. One of them was already in the Ministry, and I believe had come on option from India. He is a pre-Partition government servant. He was in the Ministry before I became the Foreign Minister. One of them had been selected as the result of a competitive examination held before Partition. Two of them have been selected subsequently through the Public Service Commission, but both were Government servants when they were selected. Out of these three who have been recruited

since Partition, with regard to two I did not even know that they were Ahmadis till after they had joined the service.

Of the only two posts with regard to which I have authority to make appointments myself, namely, my Private Secretary and my Personal Assistant, not one has at any time been occupied by an Ahmadi. I have no concern with recruitment to the ministerial posts in the Ministry or abroad. To my knowledge, so far as I am aware, there are in our Missions abroad only three Ahmadis in ministerial posts. I have had no concern or connection with the recruitment of any of them. Two of them were in Government service in ministerial posts before Partition. The third, I believe, was recruited abroad altogether. In his case, I did not know till quite some time after he joined Government service, that he was an Ahmadi.

So far as recruitment to officers grades in the Government services of all other Ministries is concerned, I believe this also takes place through the Public Service Commission. I have on no occasion, directly or indirectly, tried to influence the recruitment of any person, whether an Ahmadi or a non-Ahmadi, with any member of the Public Service Commission. To my knowledge, neither the Chairman nor any member of the Public Service Commission at the Centre or in the Provinces, before Partition or after Partition, has been an Ahmadi.

- Q. Are Chaudhri Bashir Ahmad, Deputy Director-General in the Ministry of Industries, and Sheikh Ijaz Ahmad, Joint Secretary Food, your friends and Ahmadis?
- A. Yes. They are my friends and Ahmadis. Sheikh Ijaz Ahmad has now retired.
- Q. Did you first get them recruited into the service of Government?

A. No.

(Counsel, after being apprised of his responsibility, puts the following question on instructions received from Mr. Said Malik.)

Q. Is it a fact that Mirza Nasir Ahmad son and Mirza Sharif Ahmad brother of Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud Ahmad, the present head of the Ahmadiyya community, were convicted by the Martial Law tribunal during the disturbances?

A. Yes.

Q. Were they released soon after the lifting of the Martial Law regime?

A. I do not know whether they were released before or after the lifting of the Martial Law regime.

Q. My instructions are that you interested yourself in the matter of their release by interceding with the authorities including the Governor-General, the Prime Minister and Col. Iskandar Mirza, the Defence Secretary, and obtained their release?

A. The release was on their petition and was the act, I believe, of the Governor-General, but other official machinery might have come into operation, though not to my knowledge. But, so far as the case is concerned, the matter was openly mentioned in the conference of Governors, Ministers, Chief Ministers, and the Cabinet, in which the Governor-General was present, as a scandal and one of the very high dignitaries present himself described the conviction of these two persons as a brutal instance. It was common knowledge and had been openly canvassed generally. One of the confidential reports circulated to all members of the Cabinet itself said that opinion had been shocked over these convictions.

TO COURT:

Q. What were these men convicted for and what were the allegations against them?

A. So far as I am aware, the cases were as follows:

In the case of Mirza Nasir Ahmad, he had, in compliance with one of the Martial Law Regulations, declared all his firearms and obtained a regular permit in respect thereof. Quite some time after, a search was carried out of his house and from his wife's trunk was discovered a jewelled dagger, which was a family heirloom, her father having been one of the Khans of Malerkotla and a close relation of the Nawab of Malerkotla. He was the elder brother of the late Nawab Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan. The dagger was a present by the father to the daughter on the occasion of her wedding. On account of his wife having in her trunk among her jewellery, this dagger, Mirza Nasir Ahmad M.A., (Oxen), Principal of the Ta'leem-ul-Islam College was sentenced to five years' rigorous imprisonment and Rs 10,000/- fine. In the other case of Mirza Sharif Ahmed, with a similar background, that is to say some time after he had declared his firearms and obtained a permit for them, search of his house was carried out. He was the Managing Director of the Precision Manufacturing Company. The Company had a regular licence for all that it manufactured. A room in the house was also the registered office of this Company. In the previous year, the Company had been asked to submit a sample of a bayonet to the military authorities. This they had done. The sample submitted was returned with a report that, in certain particulars, it did not comply with the specifications which had been laid down. This report, pointing out the defects in the sample submitted, was attached to the sample.

In that condition this sample was discovered from one of the almirahs in the room which was the registered office of this Company. For the presence of this sample in that room,

Mirza Sherif Ahmad was sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment and Rs 10,000/- fine.

To Counsel, contd.-

Q. Where from did you get all these details?

A. I got them partly from the official reports and partly from my inquiries, being a person interested in these gentlemen, as to what had happened.

Q. Do you know that Maulana Maudoodi was sentenced to death for an offence under section 153-A, read with some Martial Law Regulation, although this offence is normally punishable with the maximum penalty of two years' rigorous imprisonment?

A. I do not know the technical particulars, but I know he was also convicted.

Q. Do you know General Haya-ud-Din? Is he an Ahmadi?

A. Yes. He used to be an Ahmadi at one time, but I have not met him for some time and do not know where he is an Ahmadi now.

Q. Is it correct that Mian Ziauddin is an Ahmadi?

A. He was at no time an Ahmadi. Apart from the Foreign Service officers, nobody who is holding a diplomatic appointment on behalf of the Government of Pakistan, as Ambassador or Minister, is an Ahmadi, nor has any Ahmadi at any time held any such post.

To Mr. Mazhar Ali Azhar, on behalf of Majlis-i-Ahrar:

Q. Did you make the speech, Ex.D.E.119, on the 8th of August 1952, in the Ahmadiyya Hall at Karachi?

A. I have on several occasions delivered the Friday sermon and sometimes even otherwise addressed meetings of the community. This report could not possibly be a correct representation of anything I may have said because it describes one or two incidents quite inaccurately which had been published by me

as long ago as 1939. So far as my attitude with regard to my office is concerned, I do regard my holding of it as a great honour bestowed upon me through the sheer grace of God and not on account of any merit of my own. I regard it as a trust and responsibility which I must not, by my own volition, lightly throw away. On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that the Prime Minister can at any time call upon any of his colleagues to give up his office. Throughout this agitation I had made it perfectly clear to the then Prime Minister that I was ready to go at a moment's notice if he considered that I was a liability, or, for any other reason, ought to resign and leave the Government. To the extent to which this report reflects that view, it is a correct representation of my position.

Q. You say in this speech that a friend had asked you to leave these ungrateful people and come abroad. Is that correct?

A. Several people had, during the course of this agitation, suggested to me, both in letters and orally, that I should resign my office. Naturally, once I resign my office I would leave the Government. Beyond this I do not understand the reference to "come away". I have received no such suggestion from abroad.

Q. Did you say in a khutba that you would resign if the Pakistan Government did not take severe action against the opponents of Ahmadis?

A. I never said that. In any case, it contradicts both the heading and the earlier part of the news published in the "Zamindar".

Q. Did anybody bring this report to your notice?

A. No.

To Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash, on behalf of Majlis-i-Amal:-

Q. In 1947 when you went to Geneva to attend a meeting of



the U.N.O., it is stated that the Arab delegates asked you to prolong your stay by a few days. What was your answer to them?

- A. The technical answer to this question is that there was no meeting of the Assembly of U.N.O. in Geneva in 1947. The meetings were held outside New York, at Lake Success and Flushing Meadows.

The incident referred to in the question arose as follows. The Palestine question, which came up for discussion during that session, had been fully discussed and debated. It had even been voted upon in Committee. I had myself been Chairman of one of the sub-committees appointed to consider this question. Towards the close of the session, some of the representatives of the Arab States, learning of my intention to return a few days before the end of the session, requested me to stay on till the end the session. I was then constitutional adviser to His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal. I was holding no office under the Pakistan Government. The greater part, in fact almost the whole, of the work of the session had been concluded. Two delegates on the Pakistan Delegation had already been permitted by me to leave. Even if I had left at that stage, there were two or three other delegates on our delegation who could have adequately looked after such formal proceedings as had yet to take place. In the meantime, while I had been away in connection with the session or the Assembly, there had been serious disturbances in East Punjab during which all sorts of horrors were practised against the Muslims. Qadian, which had been my own home also for several years, had suffered along with the rest of those areas. My own house had been looted. During my absence, my only sister had died. My brother, next younger to me, was

found suffering from galloping T.B. All these considerations necessitated my early return. Ever since taking up my duties with His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal I had spent the greater part of my time in serving the cause and interests of Pakistan, first in connection with the Boundary Commission and then in connection with the United Nations Assembly. I had spent very little time at Bhopal. When the Arab delegates approached me, I explained the position to them both with regard to His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal and also with regard to the situation at Qadian and my own home. They suggested they would approach His Highness and the head of the Ahmadiyya Movement asking them to urge me to stay on. They enquired whether in case these two were willing to let me stay on I would be prepared to extend my stay. I said I would reconcile myself to the position. They then sent telegrams to His Highness and the head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, both of whom suggested that I should stay on till the end of the session, which I did. On my return, I found my brother at death's door. All I was able to do was to press his hands in farewell. The point of the question, I understand, is that I did not refer the Arab Delegates to the Pakistan Government and mentioned only His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal and the head of the Ahmadiyya Movement. I was then, as I have said, resident in Bhopal. My official duty, such as it was, lay there. My domestic interests were all at Qadian. They had suffered serious damage and were in further jeopardy. The only responsibility I owed to the Pakistan Government at that time was to see that the functions of the delegation were properly discharged. They had been completely discharged by that time, except for a few formalities. My position on the delegation in my absence could be appropriately and

adequately taken by the Pakistan Ambassador to Washington who was No: 2 Delegate on the delegation. In fact, during my few days prolonged stay in New York nothing transpired which showed that my presence there had been necessary.

Q. Did you tell the Arab Delegates that when addressing the head of your community they should use the word “Amir-ul-Mo’mineen”?

A. No. I might myself have used that expression when referring to him.

Q. Did you want to suggest to them that in the Islamic country of Pakistan there is a de facto Amir-ul-Mo’mineen?

A. No.

Q. Did you in 1951 when you went to America to represent the Pakistan Government present to President Truman a copy of the Commentary on the Holy Qur’an published by the Ahmadiyya Movement.

A. I was present in Washington when President Truman delivered his message to the nation. I was due to see him the next day. When I saw him, I commented upon his speech and, with reference to one or two principles that he had enunciated, I told him that they brought to my mind certain verses of the Qur’an which I rendered into English. He said he was deeply interested and would like to have the original. Thereupon, I sent him the next day a copy of the English translation of the Holy Qur’an, First Volume, published by the Movement, which I procured from Washington itself.

Q. Did you use the title “Sir” as part of the address on the letters which were published in the Zamindar?

A. Yes. This is done for the purpose of facilitating the delivery of the mails.

Q. Did Sirdar Abdur Rab Nishtar in a Cabinet meeting held in

August 1952 over which you presided tell you that yours was the only community against whom complaints of proselytising had been made?

- A. When I arrived for the Cabinet meeting, one of the Secretaries told me that Khwaja Nazim-ud-Din was indisposed and would not be able to preside over the meeting. He also gave me a draft saying that Khwaja Sahib wanted to put it to the Cabinet and to have it passed. I read it through and commented that this document mentioned one community meaning the Ahmadis, and that this was unfair in the sense that there was no proof that anything was being done by the Ahmadis. On this Sirdar Abdur Rab Nishtar said that the communique did not say that this was being done but that complaints had been received to that effect. I said that even then it singled out a community with regard to that complaint. He said that we could modify this communique if there was any other community with similar complaints against it. I pointed out that there was a good deal of complaint with regard to the Juma'at-i-Islami. He said that the Juma'at-i-Islami was a political Juma'at and with regard to it there was already a decision that any Government servant who joins it would be violating the Government Servants Conduct Rules. He then went on to say that this was only a preamble and that the directive part of the communique did not make any discrimination and was directed to all communities.

- Q. What position did you occupy when you wrote the letter Ex.D.E.256?

- A. When I wrote this letter in November 1947, I held no official position under the Pakistan Government. I was then leading the Pakistan Delegation to the United Nations. I was Constitutional Adviser to His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal.

To Mr. Asadullah Khan for the Sadr Anjuman Ahmadiyya Rabwah:-

Q. Will you recall that the meeting in Jehangir Park took place on the 17th and 18th of May and that you delivered the speech on the 18th, not on the 17th?

A. I am not quite definite about the date. The meeting took place on two days. I did not attend the meeting on the first day. My speech was on the second day.

To Court:-

Q. Had there been any disturbance on the first day?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you wearing a helmet when you went to the meeting in the Jehangir Park?

A. No.

Q. Who appointed you to represent the Muslim League case before the Boundary Commission?

A. The Quaid-i-Azam sent for me from Bhopal and asked me to undertake the presentation of the Muslim League case before the Boundary Commission.

Q. Did you in the course of your arguments to the Boundary Commission say that Ahmadis constituted a separate community from the Musalmans?

A. No. So far as my recollection goes, any reference that I made to Qadian, or the Ahmadiyya movement or the community during the course of my address to the Commission was with a view to reinforce the argument that Gurdaspur District should form part of West Punjab and should be within Pakistan.

Q. Who selected the title “Zinda Mazhab” for your speech in Jehangir Park?

A. I myself.

Q. Why did you select this title?

A. I believe that one of the outstanding features that distinguishes Islam from other faiths is that in Islam the means of keeping fresh the fundamental teachings and of unfolding from the Qur'an such philosophy behind those teachings as may be needed from time to time is provided for and this provision has not been made in any other faith, which is a divine indication that while those faiths were meant only for certain periods of human history, Islam is meant for ever.

Q. It has been hinted in the cross-examination of Maulana Maikash that you did not wish to put the Arab case before the U.N.A. Have you as representative of Pakistan to the U.N.O. ever interested yourself in questions coming up before that Assembly which are of general importance to the Muslim world.

A. I have from the day that Pakistan became a member of the U.N.O. always led the Pakistan Delegation to the annual sessions of the General Assembly. Whenever any question of general Muslim interest has come up, for example, the question of Palestine, the question of Libya, the question of Eritrea, the question of Somaliland, the question of Morocco and the question of Tunisia, I have myself dealt with it. I believe that the presentation of those cases on behalf of Pakistan to the U.N.A. has always been acknowledged by the peoples concerned and by the other Muslim States as an outstanding contribution.

Q. Can you now recall the purport of your speech at San Francisco?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you say something about Islam in that speech? If so, did your speech have any sectarian tendency?

A. One of the aspects of the Japanese Treaty that was causing a certain amount of discussion even among those States who were prepared to subscribe to it was that Japan was being too generously dealt with. On the other hand, there was a tendency to hold up the United States as doing something unique in human history in presenting a generous treaty to a vanquished foe. The purport of my speech was that the most outstanding instance of generosity in human history to a vanquished foe was the treatment that the Holy Prophet of Islam had meted out to the conquered Quresh on the occasion of the Peace of Mecca. This made a most profound impression not only on the statesmen assembled but also, as the proceedings were being televised and broadcast, throughout the United States. One echo that has reached me and which I mention as ahadis-a-nemat is that when the matter was subsequently taken up in the Parliament of Australia, the opposition naturally drew attention to this generous feature of the treaty and based their opposition to the treaty on that ground. A member of the party in power, in the course of his speech said that on this occasion they should act in the spirit in which the Prophet of Islam had acted at the time of the conquest of Mecca and I am sure that he could only have taken that reference from my speech.

While on my speeches, I should like to reply to the criticism of the Jamaat-i-Islami that in the Paris session of the General Assembly in 1951, when I made a grievance of the ill-treatment meted out to an Ahmadi in one of the British colonies, I made no reference to general Muslim subject in which the Muslim interests are opposed to those of the Western countries. I wish to state that the greater part of that speech of mine was concerned with the condemnation

of the colonial system both in its political and economical aspects. That condemnation was most emphatic and was passionately delivered. In the course of that condemnation, as an instance of the arrogance of colonial officialdom, I referred to the illtreatment of a Pakistani citizen in one of the British colonies. I did not mention the name of the Colony. I cannot vouch for it because I cannot just now refresh my memory, but I believe that the fact that he was an Ahmadi was not even mentioned. It was, however, merely to illustrate the working of colonialism that the incident was cited. In the course of the same session, the question came up of putting the Moroccan and Tunisian question on the agenda. Again mine was the outstanding speech on that aspect which contained a severe condemnation of the attitude of those States including the U.S.A. who were opposed to putting the item on the agenda. I particularly recall that when I mentioned that in the case of refusal to consider these questions, there might be bloodshed in Morocco and that the principal responsibility for that blood shed would be on the shoulders of the delegate of the United States who had spoken before me, he went pale at the vehemence with which that condemnation was delivered. It is, therefore, very unfair to suggest that though I took up the advocacy of an Ahmadi who had been illtreated, I paid no attention to questions of general interest for Muslims.

To Mr. Faiyaz Ali, Advocate-General, Pakistan, on behalf of the Central Government:-

- Q. Did you deal with the mercy petitions of persons convicted by the Martial Law Courts while the Prime Minister of Pakistan had gone to England in connection with the Coronation?
- A. No. I disposed of all the business pertaining to the office of the Prime Minister as well as to that of the Defence Minister



but the only item that I did not deal with was these mercy petitions.

Q. Deliberately?

A. Yes. I myself suggested to the Prime Minister before he went abroad that it would be best if I did not deal with these petitions.

Q. Who determines the foreign policy of Pakistan?

A. The Central Cabinet.

To Mr. Yaqub Ali Khan counsel for Mr. Daultana:-

Q. The ex-Chief Minister of the Punjab states that during your visit to Lahore in the first week of October 1952 he asked you to use your good offices with the then Prime Minister to formulate his policy with regard to the three demands and the agitation and that the Chief Minister also said that the coming session of All Pakistan Muslim League at Dacca would be utilized for mobilising public opinion. Is it correct?

A. He might have said so, but I would not be prepared to say that he did not say so nor that he did say so.

R.O. & A.C.

16th January 1954.

PRESIDENT.

Sd/- M.R.Kayani.

MEMBER.

ORDER.

Adjourned till Monday, the 18th January 1954.

PRESIDENT.

16th January 1954.

Sd/ M.R.Kayani.

MEMBER.

## Endnotes

1. جیسا کہ مومن کے لئے دوسرے احکام الہی پر ایمان لانا فرض ہے ایسا ہی اس بات پر بھی ایمان فرض ہے کہ آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے دوبعث ہیں (۱) ایک بعث محمدی جو جلالی رنگ میں ہے۔ . . . . (۲) دوسرا بعث احمدی جو جمالی رنگ میں ہے۔

Just as it is incumbent on a believer to accept all the commandments of God, it is also necessary for them to accept that the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> has two advents. The first advent is the Muhammadi advent, which is glorious in its nature, and the second advent was the Ahmadi advent, which is a manifestation of splendour.

*Tohfa-e-Golarhviyyah, Ruhani Khaza'in Vol. 17, p. 254*

2. ورنہ حضرت مسیح موعودؑ نے تو فرمایا ہے کہ ان کا اسلام اور ہے اور ہمارا اور ان کا خدا اور ہے ہمارا خدا اور ہمارا حج اور ہے ان کا حج اور اسی طرح ان سے ہر بات میں اختلاف ہے۔  
Otherwise, the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup> has said that the other Muslims have their own version of Islam and we have our own, and they have their own God and we have our own, and they have their own Hajj and we have our own, and in this way we differ with them on all major issues.

*Alfazl, 21 August 1917, p. 8*

3. اب ایک اور سوال رہ جاتا ہے کہ غیر احمدی تو حضرت مسیح موعودؑ کے منکر ہوئے اس لئے ان کا جنازہ نہیں پڑھنا چاہئے۔ لیکن اگر کسی غیر احمدی کا چھوٹا بچہ مر جائے۔ تو اس کا جنازہ کیوں نہ پڑھا جائے۔ وہ تو مسیح موعودؑ کا کفر نہیں۔ میں یہ سوال کرنے والے سے پوچھتا ہوں کہ اگر یہ بات درست ہے تو پھر ہندوؤں اور عیسائیوں کے بچوں کا جنازہ کیوں نہیں پڑھا جاتا۔

One question that remains is while we do not observe the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis because they have rejected the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup>, what is stopping us from observing the funeral prayer of non-Ahmadi children when they are not deniers of his truth? I ask those who pose this question, that if in principle this position is true, why do we not also observe the funeral rites of Hindu and Christian children?

*Anwar-e-Khilafat, Anwar-ul-'Uloom*, Vol. 3, p. 150

4. علاوہ اس کے جو مجھے نہیں مانتا وہ خدا اور رسول کو بھی نہیں مانتا۔  
Besides this, one who does not accept me, does not accept God and His Messenger either.

*Haqiqatul Wahi, Ruhani Khaza'in* Vol. 22, p. 168

5. پاکستان اور آزاد حکومت کا مطالبہ ہندوستان کی غلامی کو مضبوط کر نیوالی زنجیریں ہیں۔  
The demand for Pakistan and independent governance will only serve to tighten the bonds of servitude by which India is chained.

*Alfazel*, 11 June 1944, p. 1 [Publishers]

6. اس لئے ہمیں کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ ہندو مسلم سوال اٹھ جائے۔ اور ساری قومیں شیر و شکر ہو کر رہیں۔ تاملک کے حصے بخرے نہ ہوں بے شک یہ کام بہت مشکل ہے۔ مگر اس کے نتائج بھی بہت شاندار ہیں۔ . . . . . ممکن ہے عارضی طور پر افتراق پیدا ہو اور کچھ وقت کے لئے دونوں قومیں جدا جدا رہیں مگر یہ حالت عارضی ہوگی۔ اور ہمیں کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ جلد دور ہو جائے۔ . . . . . بہر حال ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ اکھنڈ ہندوستان بنے اور ساری قومیں باہم شیر و شکر ہو کر رہیں۔

Therefore, we ought to erase the Hindu-Muslim question so that all communities should be happy and able to thrive, and also to protect the country from division. This is undoubtedly difficult, but the payoff is immense. While there may be momentary disputes between the two nations, they will be short-lived and our own efforts must be focused on bringing them to a quick resolution. Ultimately, however, we are in favour of a united India in which all communities live together in harmony and thrive.

سوال:- کیا پاکستان عملاً ممکن ہے؟  
جواب:- سیاسی اور اقتصادی لحاظ سے اس سوال کو دیکھا جائے تو پاکستان ممکن ہے۔ لیکن میرا ذاتی خیال یہ ہے کہ ملک کے حصے بخرے کرنے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں۔

Q: Is the creation of Pakistan possible?

A: Looking at this question from a political and economic perspective, Pakistan is possible. But I personally believe that there is no need for partition.

8. میں قبل ازیں بتا چکا ہوں کہ اللہ تعالیٰ کی مشیت ہندوستان کو اکٹھا رکھنا چاہتی ہے۔ لیکن اگر قوموں کی غیر معمولی منافرت کی وجہ سے عارضی طور پر الگ بھی کرنا پڑے تو یہ اور بات ہے۔ بسا اوقات عضو ماؤف کو ڈاکٹر کاٹ دینے کا بھی مشورہ دیتے ہیں۔ لیکن یہ خوشی سے نہیں ہوتا۔ بلکہ مجبوری اور معذوری کے عالم میں اور صرف اسی وقت جب اس کے بغیر چارہ نہ ہو۔ اور اگر پھر یہ معلوم ہو جائے کہ اس ماؤف عضو کی جگہ نیا لگ سکتا ہے تو کون جاہل انسان اس کے لئے کوشش نہیں کریگا۔ اسی طرح ہندوستان کی تقسیم پر اگر ہم رضا مند ہوئے ہیں تو خوشی سے نہیں بلکہ مجبوری سے اور پھر یہ کوشش کریں گے کہ یہ کسی نہ کسی طرح جلد متحد ہو جائے۔

I have already said that it is the will of Allah the Exalted to keep India united. But if it has to be split up for a time due to the extraordinary resentments that have currently built up amongst Hindus and Muslims, that is another matter. In the course of certain procedures, physicians will recommend that a certain limb is cut off out of necessity when no other medical option is available. And if the patient understands that the loss of the limb can be offset in other ways, then only a fool would not opt for this choice. Similarly, if we have agreed to the partition of India, we do so unwillingly and out of compulsion and sooner or later we will seek to reunite it.

9. ان حالات کے پیش نظر ان کا حق ہے کہ وہ یہ مطالبہ کریں اور ہر دیانتدار کا فرض ہے کہ خواہ اس میں اس کا نقصان ہو۔ مسلمانوں کے اس مطالبہ کی تائید کرے۔ . . . . . بیشک

ہمیں مسلمانوں کی طرف سے بھی بعض اوقات تکالیف پہنچ جاتی ہیں۔ اور ہم تسلیم کر لیتے ہیں کہ شاید وہ ہمیں پھانسی پر چڑھا دیں گے۔ لیکن میں ہندوؤں سے یہ پوچھتا ہوں۔ کہ تم لوگوں نے ہمیں کب سکھ دیا تھا۔ تم لوگوں نے ہمیں کب آرام پہنچایا تھا۔ اور تم لوگوں نے کب ہمارے ساتھ ہمدردی کی تھی۔

Under these circumstances, they have the right to make any such demands and it is the obligation of all just-minded people to support the Muslims in this, even if it might incur them some loss or harm...even though there have been times where Muslims have caused us pain and anguish, and we know well that if it were up to them they might well execute us, yet still I ask the Hindus when have they ever let us live in peace or security and ease, and when have they ever extended sympathy to us.

*Alfazl*, 21 May 1947, p. 4

10. اب زمانہ بدل گیا ہے۔ دیکھو پہلے جو مسیحؑ آیا تھا۔ اسے دشمنوں نے صلیب پر چڑھایا۔ مگر اب مسیحؑ اس لئے آیا کہ اپنے مخالفین کو موت کے گھاٹ اتارے۔

The world has changed. The Messiah<sup>as</sup> of the past was put on the cross by his enemies, but the Messiah<sup>as</sup> of the present age has come to defeat his foes.

*Khitab Jalsa Salana 17 March 1919, Anwar-ul-'Uloom*, Vol. 4, p. 415

11. لیکن کیا ہمیں اس کا کچھ جواب نہیں دینا چاہئے؟ اور اس خون کا بدلہ نہیں لینا چاہئے؟ ضرور لینا چاہئے لیکن اسی طریق سے جو حضرت مسیح موعودؑ نے بتایا ہے اور جو یہ ہے کہ کابل کی سرزمین سے اگر ایک احمدیت کا پودا کاٹا گیا ہے۔ تو اب خدا تعالیٰ اس کی بجائے ہزاروں وہاں لگائے گا اس سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ سید عبداللطیف صاحب شہید کے قتل کا بدلہ یہ نہیں رکھا گیا کہ ہم ان کے قاتلوں کو قتل کریں اور ان کے خون بہائیں کیونکہ قتل کرنا ہمارا کام نہیں۔ ہمیں خدا تعالیٰ نے پر امن ذرائع سے کام کرنے کے لئے کھڑا کیا ہے نہ کہ اپنے دشمنوں کو قتل کرنے کے لئے۔ پس ہمارا انتقام یہ ہے کہ ان کے اور ان کی نسل کے دلوں میں احمدیت کا بیج بونیں اور انہیں احمدی بنائیں۔ اور جس چیز کو وہ مٹانا چاہتے ہیں اسکو ہم قائم کر دیں۔ . . . . مگر اب ہمارا یہ کام ہے کہ ان کے خون کا بدلہ لیں اور ان کے قاتل جس چیز کو مٹانا چاہتے ہیں اسے قائم کر دیں اور چونکہ خدا کی برگزیدہ جماعتوں میں شامل ہونے والے اسی طرح سزا دیا کرتے ہیں کہ اپنے دشمنوں پر احسان کرتے ہیں۔ اسلئے ہمارا بھی یہ کام

نہیں ہے کہ سید عبداللطیف صاحب کے قتل کرنے والوں کو دنیا سے مٹا دیں اور قتل کر دیں بلکہ یہ ہے کہ انہیں ہمیشہ کے لئے قائم کر دیں اور ابدی زندگی کے مالک بنا دیں۔ اور اس کا طریق یہی ہے کہ انہیں احمدی بنالیں۔

And should we not respond to this provocation? Should this blood not be avenged? Yes it must, but in the same manner spoken of by the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup> when he said that even if a single shrub of Ahmadiyyat is uprooted from the land of Kabul God Almighty will grow thousands more in its place.

From this, it is clear that the revenge for the killing of Syed Abdul Latif Sahib Shaheed was not to kill his murderers and shed their blood because that is not our right. We have been raised by God Almighty to act with peace and not violence. So our revenge is to sow the seed of Ahmadiyyat in the hearts and descendants of our enemies and convert them to our faith and establish in the earth what they seek to destroy...So now we must avenge their blood and establish what their murderers seek to destroy, since those who join the ranks of God's blessed people take their revenge by practising mercy on their enemies. Therefore, it is not for us to wipe out and kill the murderers of Syed Abdul Latif Sahib from this world, but it is to guide them forever to the right faith and give them eternal life. And the way to do this is to make them Ahmadi.

*Khitaab Jalsa Salana 17 March 1919, Anwar-ul-Uloom, Vol. 4, p. 422*

12. ہاں آخری وقت آن پہنچا ہے۔ ان تمام علمائے حق کے خون کا بدلہ لینے کا جن کو شروع سے لیکر آج تک یہ خونیں مٹاؤں قتل کر دتے آئے ہیں۔ ان سب کے خون کا بدلہ لیا جائیگا
- (۱) عطا اللہ شاہ بخاری سے
- (۲) ملا بدایونی سے
- (۳) ملا احتشام الحق سے
- (۴) ملا محمد شفیع سے
- (۵) ملا مودودی (پانچویں سوار) سے

The time has come to avenge those righteous ulema whose blood

has continued to be spilled by these savage mullahs. There must be retribution for this violence from:

- (1) Ata Ullah Shah Bukhari
- (2) Mullah Badayuni
- (3) Mullah Ehtisham ul Haq
- (4) Mullah Muhammad Shafi
- (5) Mullah Maududi

*Alfazl*, 15 July 1952, p. 4

13. خلیفہ ہو۔ تو جو پہلا ہو اسکی بیعت کرو۔ جو بعد میں دوسرا پہلے کے مقابل پر کھڑا ہو جائے جیسے لاہور میں ہے۔ تو اسے قتل کر دو۔ مگر یہ قتل کا حکم تب ہے۔ جب سلطنت اپنی ہو اب اس حکومت میں ہم ایسا نہیں کر سکتے۔

If a caliphate is established you should pledge allegiance to it. Whosoever then stands against the first caliph, as happened in Lahore, should be killed. But any such retribution can only be meted once we have established our own state. We cannot take the law into our own hand under the current system.

*Tashheez-ul-Azhan*, June 1919, p. 38

14. یاد رکھو۔ تبلیغ اس وقت تک کامیاب نہیں ہو سکتی۔ جب تک ہماری بیس (Base) مضبوط نہ ہو۔ پہلے بیس مضبوط ہو۔ تو پھر تبلیغ پھیلتی ہے۔

Always bear in mind that our preaching cannot be successful until we have a strong foundation. Only then will our message be spread.

*Alfazl*, 13 August 1948, p. 5

15. میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ اب یہ صوبہ ہمارے ہاتھوں سے نکل نہیں سکتا۔ یہ ہمارا ہی شکار ہو گا۔ دنیا کی ساری قومیں مل کر بھی ہم سے اب یہ علاقہ چھین نہیں سکتیں۔

I am certain this province will not be separated from us, and it will be ours. Even if all the nations of the world were to come together, they will not be able to take this territory away from us.

*Alfazl*, 23 October 1948, p. 5

گویہ زمین موجودہ صورت میں واقعی مہنگی ہے۔ اور اس میں کوئی جاذبیت نہیں ہے۔ لیکن 16. اللہ تعالیٰ کے فضل سے ہم اسے ایک نہایت شاندار شہر کی صورت میں تبدیل کرنے کا تہیہ کر چکے ہیں۔ جو دفاعی لحاظ سے بھی پاکستان میں محفوظ ترین مقام ہوگا۔

Even though this land is barren and comes at a great cost, we have determined, that by the grace of God, we will transform it into a magnificent city that will be the securest and safest place for us in Pakistan.

*Alfazl, 09 November 1948, p. 2*

پھر ماسوا اس کے کیا کسی مرتد کے ارتداد سے یہ نتیجہ نکل سکتا ہے کہ وہ سلسلہ جس میں 17. سے یہ مرتد خارج ہوا حق نہیں ہے۔ کیا ہمارے مخالف علماء کو خبر نہیں کہ کئی بد بخت حضرت مولوی کے زمانہ میں اُن سے مرتد ہو گئے تھے۔ پھر کئی لوگ حضرت عیسیٰ سے مرتد ہوئے اور پھر کئی بد بخت اور بد قسمت ہمارے نبی صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کے عہد میں آپ سے مرتد ہو گئے چنانچہ مسیلہ کذاب بھی مرتدین میں سے ایک تھا۔

What is more, can it be concluded from the apostasy of an apostate that the faith he forsook is not true? Are our opposing clerics unaware that many a wretch turned apostate in the time of Hazrat Musa, many defected from Hazrat 'Isa, and, similarly, many wretched and unfortunate persons turned apostate in the days of our Holy Prophet, may peace and blessings of Allah be upon him? Thus, Musaylima Kazzab too was one of the apostates.

*Haqiqatul Wahi, Ruhani Khaza'in Vol. 22, p. 127*

18. ماسوا اس کے یہ بھی تو سمجھو کہ شریعت کیا چیز ہے جس نے اپنی وحی کے ذریعہ سے چند امر اور نہی بیان کئے اور اپنی امت کے لئے ایک قانون مقرر کیا وہی صاحب الشریعت ہو گیا۔ پس اس تعریف کے رو سے بھی ہمارے مخالف ملزم ہیں کیونکہ میری وحی میں امر بھی ہیں اور نہی بھی۔ \* مثلاً یہ اَلْهَامُ قُلْ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ يُغْضُوا مِنْ ابْصَارِهِمْ وَيَحْفَظُوا اَفْزَوْجَهُمْ ذٰلِكَ اَزْكَى لَهُمْ۔ یہ براہین احمدیہ میں درج ہے اور اس میں امر بھی ہے اور نہی بھی اور اس پر تینیس برس کی مدت بھی گزر گئی اور ایسا ہی اب تک میری وحی میں امر بھی ہوتے ہیں اور نہی بھی اور اگر کہو کہ شریعت سے وہ شریعت مراد ہے جس میں نئے احکام ہوں تو یہ باطل ہے۔ اللہ تعالیٰ فرماتا ہے اِنَّ هٰذَا لَفِي الضُّحٰفِ الْاُولٰٓئِ۔ صُحُفٌ اِنْزٰیہِمۡہِمْ وَمُؤَسٰی یعنی قرآنی تعلیم توریت میں بھی موجود ہے۔ اور اگر یہ کہو کہ شریعت وہ ہے جس میں باستیفاء امر اور نہی کا ذکر ہو تو یہ بھی باطل ہے



کیونکہ اگر توریت یا قرآن شریف میں باستیفاء احکام شریعت کا ذکر ہوتا تو پھر اجتہاد کی گنجائش نہ رہتی۔ غرض یہ سب خیالات فضول اور کوتاہ اندیشیاں ہیں۔ ہمارا ایمان ہے کہ آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم خاتم الانبیاء ہیں۔ اور قرآن ربانی کتابوں کا خاتم ہے تاہم خدا تعالیٰ نے اپنے نفس پر یہ حرام نہیں کیا کہ تجدید کے طور پر کسی اور مامور کے ذریعہ سے یہ احکام صادر کرے کہ جھوٹ نہ بولو۔ جھوٹی گواہی نہ دو۔ زنا نہ کرو۔ خون نہ کرو۔ اور ظاہر ہے کہ ایسا بیان کرنا بیان شریعت ہے جو مسیح موعود کا بھی کام ہے۔ پھر وہ دلیل تمہاری کیسی گاؤ خورد ہو گئی کہ اگر کوئی شریعت لاوے اور مفتری ہو تو وہ تینیس ۳۳ برس تک زندہ نہیں رہ سکتا۔

\* چونکہ میری تعلیم میں امر بھی ہے اور نہی بھی اور شریعت کے ضروری احکام کی تجدید ہے اس لئے خدا تعالیٰ نے میری تعلیم کو اور اس وحی کو جو میرے پر ہوتی ہے فُک یعنی کشتی کے نام سے موسوم کیا جیسا کہ ایک الہام الہی کی یہ عبارت ہے۔ وَاضْجَعِ الْفُلْکَ بِأَعْيُنِنَا وَوَحِّیْنَا إِنَّ الدِّیْنَ یُبَیِّنُ لَکَ اِمَّا یُبَیِّنُ عَلَیْکَ اللّٰهُ یَدُلُّ اللّٰهُ فَوْقَ اَیْدِیْہِمۡ۔ یعنی اس تعلیم اور تجدید کی کشتی کو ہماری آنکھوں کے سامنے اور ہماری وحی سے بنا۔ جو لوگ تجھ سے بیعت کرتے ہیں وہ خدا سے بیعت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ خدا کا ہاتھ ہے جو اُن کے ہاتھوں پر ہے۔ اب دیکھو خدا نے میری وحی اور میری تعلیم اور میری بیعت کو نوح کی کشتی قرار دیا اور تمام انسانوں کے لئے اسکو مدارِ نجات ٹھہرایا جس کی آنکھیں ہوں دیکھیں اور جس کے کان ہوں سنے۔ منہ

Besides, pray understand what is the sharia? Anyone who, based on his revelations, declares certain commandments and prohibitions, and brings a law for his people, he becomes a law-bearing messenger. According to this definition also, our opponents are still at fault, because in my revelations there are both permissions and prohibitions. For example, this revelation is written in *Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya: Direct the believers to restrain their looks from na mahram [those outside the prohibited category] and to guard their private parts and ears from unworthy acts. That is required and essential for their attainment of purification. (Tadhkira, p. 101, 2009 Ed.)*

In this there is both a command and also a prohibition; and twenty-three years have passed. Similarly, there are commandments and prohibitions in my revelations even now. If you say that sharia means new commandments, then this too is incorrect. Allah the Exalted says: *This indeed is what is taught*

*in the former Scriptures—The Scriptures of Abraham and Moses.*  
(Surah Al-A'la, 87:19-20)

That is, the Qur'anic teachings are also present in the Torah. If it is alleged that a sharia must contain complete and conclusive commandments and prohibitions, then this too is not correct. If all the commandments of the Torah and the Qur'an were complete in their details, then no room would be left for Ijtihad [exegesis of divine law]. Hence, all these thoughts are vain and short-sighted. Our belief is that the Holy Prophet [may peace and blessing of Allah be on him] is the Seal of the Prophets, and the Holy Qur'an is the Seal of all Divine Scriptures. Nevertheless, Allah the Exalted has not made it unlawful upon Himself that, for the sake of reformation, He should issue commandments through His commissioned one such as not to tell lies, not to give false testimony, not to commit adultery, and not to kill. Evidently, to make such statements is to put forth the sharia, which is also the task of the Promised Messiah. Thus your argument is baseless that anyone who brings a sharia and forges lies against God, cannot stay alive for twenty-three years.

\* In my teachings, there are permissions and prohibitions, as well as a revival of the necessary commandments of the sharia. That is why God the Exalted named my teachings and the revelation that I receive, **قُلُوكْ** Fulk', that is, 'Ark'. One of my revelations states: *And construct the ark under Our supervision and Our revelation. Those who make the covenant with you enter into a covenant with Allah. The hand of Allah is above their hands.* (Tadhkira, p. 214, 2009 Ed.)

That is, Build this ark of teaching and revival in front of Our eyes and with Our revelation! Those who make bai'at with you, make bai'at with God. It is God's hand that is upon their hands. Now observe how God has called my revelations, my teachings and

my bai'at as Noah's Ark, declaring them the means of salvation for all mankind. Those who have eyes should see; and those who have ears, should listen.

*Arba'een 4, Ruhani Khaza'in Vol. 17, p. 435-436*

19. کمالات متفرقہ جو تمام دیگر انبیاء میں پائے جاتے تھے۔ وہ سب حضرت رسول کریمؐ میں ان سے بڑھ کر موجود تھے اور اب وہ سارے کمالات حضرت رسول کریمؐ سے ظنی طور پر ہم کو عطا کئے گئے۔ اور اسی لئے ہمارا نام آدم، ابراہیم، موسیٰ، نوح، داؤد، یوسف، سلیمان، یحییٰ، عیسیٰ وغیرہ ہے۔ چنانچہ ابراہیم ہمارا نام اس واسطے ہے کہ حضرت ابراہیم ایسے مقام میں پیدا ہوئے تھے کہ وہ بت خانہ تھا اور لوگ بت پرست تھے اور اب بھی لوگوں کا یہی حال ہے۔

The various excellences that were found individually in the other prophets were all combined in the person of the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> *par excellence*. All these excellences have now been conferred upon me through the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> by way of reflection. That is why my name is Adam, Abraham, Moses, Noah, David, Joseph, Solomon, Yahya, Jesus, etc. My name is Abraham, because Abraham was born in a place of idol worship where people were polytheists, the same is still true of the people.

*Malfuzat, Vol. 3, p. 69-70*

20. اس کے بعد خدا تعالیٰ کا حکم آیا۔ جس پر نماز غیروں کے پیچھے حرام کی گئی۔ اور اب صرف منع نہ تھی بلکہ حرام تھی۔ اور حقیقی حرمت صرف خدا تعالیٰ کی طرف سے ہوئی ہے۔

Then the commandment of God came which forbids us from offering our prayers behind others. Not only was it forbidden, but it was declared haram. And true virtue and propriety rests only with God.

*Al Qaulul Fasl, Anwar-ul-'Uloom, Vol. 2, p. 301*

21. ہمارا یہ فرض ہے کہ ہم غیر احمدیوں کو مسلمان نہ سمجھیں اور ان کے پیچھے نماز نہ پڑھیں۔ کیونکہ ہمارے نزدیک وہ خدا تعالیٰ کے ایک نبی کے منکر ہیں یہ دین کا معاملہ ہے اس میں کسی کا اپنا اختیار نہیں۔

It is incumbent on us to consider non-Ahmadis as non-Muslims and not to pray behind them because in our estimation they

reject a prophet of God. It is a religious matter and no one can have their personal say in it.

*Anwar-e-Khilafat, Anwar-ul-'Uloom, Vol. 3, p. 148*

22. میرا تو یہ عقیدہ ہے کہ دنیا میں دو گروہ ہیں ایک مومن دوسرے کافر۔ اسلئے جو حضرت مسیح موعود پر ایمان لانے والے ہیں وہ مومن ہیں اور جو ایمان نہیں لائے خواہ انکے ایمان نہ لانے کی کوئی وجہ ہو وہ کافر ہیں۔

I believe the world is divided into two groups: believers and disbelievers. Those who believe in the Promised Messiah<sup>as</sup> are believers; and those who reject him, for whatever reason, are disbelievers.

*Zikr e Ilahi*, p. 22 [Though the reference provided in the transcript of the proceedings is for *Zikr e Ilahi* p. 22, no such reference in that book exists, and at the time of publishing the exact origins of this excerpt still have not been ascertained.]

23. اللہ تعالیٰ نے جو کام ہمارے سپرد کیا وہ کسی اور امت کے سپرد نہیں کیا۔ پہلے انبیاء میں سے کوئی نبی ایک لاکھ کی طرف آیا۔ کوئی نبی دو لاکھ کی طرف آیا۔ اور کوئی دس لاکھ کی طرف آیا۔ رسول کریم صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کی قوم سوا لاکھ تھی یا ہو سکتا ہے عرب کی آبادی آپ کے زمانہ میں دو تین لاکھ ہو۔ پس یہی آپ کے پہلے مخاطب تھے۔ لیکن ہمارے چھٹے ہی ۴۰ کروڑ مخاطب ہیں۔

The task that Allah the Exalted has assigned to us was not entrusted to any other nation. Amongst the earlier prophets there were those who came to one or two hundred thousand people, or even to a million. The people of the Holy Prophet<sup>sa</sup> numbered close to 125,000 or at most three hundred thousand, and these were the first people to whom he addressed himself to, whereas we address ourselves to almost 400 million people.

*Alfazl*, 13 August 1948, p. 5

24. لَهُ خَسَفَ الْقَمَرُ الْمُنِيرُ وَإِنِّي غَسَا الْقَمَرُ إِن الْمُسْرِ فَإِنْ أَتَنَكِرُ  
For him was shown the sign of the lunar eclipse and for me of the lunar and solar both. Will you still deny my truthfulness?

*I'jaz-e-Ahmadi Zamima Nuzulul Masih, Ruhani Khaza'in Vol. 19, p. 183*





